The Church of England Pulpit,

AND

ECCLESIASTICAL REVIEW.

THE UNIVERSITY
OF ILLINOIS
LIBRARY
283.05
CHUO
v.35

THE

Church of England Pulpit,

AND

Ecclesiastical Review.

JANUARY TO JUNE, 1893.

VOL. XXXV.

LONDON:
'CHURCH OF ENGLAND PULPIT" OFFICE, 160, FLEET STREET, E.C.

CONTENTS OF VOL. XXXV.

SERMONS BY :— PAGE

Archbisbop of Dublin—Influence of Christianity in the Heart, in the Home, and in Society ... 181
Bishop of Gloucester and Bristol—The Resurrection of the Body 205
Bishop of Wakefield—The Tabernacle of God with Men 97
Bassett, Rev. H. H. Tilney—Definite Prayer ... 150
Bladon, Rev. George, B.A.—The Certainties of an Apostle 195
Carolin, Rev. Sinclair, M.A.—The Race set before us 16
Carolin, Rev. Sinclair, M.A.—Spirit-Rays 289
Carr, Rev. J. A., LL.D.—The Cry of Irish Protestantism 136
Cox, Rev. Sir George W., Bart.—Death of Sin, Death to Sin 4
Cutting, Rev. W. A.—Christ and Other-Worldliness 163
Duckworth, Rev. Canon, D.D.—The Perfection of Love 1
Duckworth, Rev. Canon, D.D.—The Temptation of Jesus 145
Eyton, Rev. Robert, M.A.—Christ's Love as a Motive 245
Farrar, Ven. Archdeacon, D.D., F.R.S.—The Power and the Glory 85
Farrar, Ven. Archdeacon, D.D., F.R.S.—Words of Consolation 133
Gunter, Rev. William, B.A.—Our Seamen as Missionaries 148, 160
Gunter, Rev. William, B.A.—The Influence of the Holy Spirit on Character 290
Hobson, Rev. W. T.—Until His Coming Again ... 25
Hobson, Rev. W. T.—Salvation from Death ... 217
Hobson, Rev. W. T.—How "Christ Died for our Sins according to the Scriptures" 256
Hogg, Rev. M. B., B.A.—Shutting the Gates of Derry 50
Hogg, Rev. M. B., B.A.—Human Affliction Divinely Shared 269
Hogg, Rev. M. B., B.A.—The Risen Jesus ... 280
Howell, Ven. David, B.D.—Fitness for Service ... 253
Jenkins, Rev. O. L. S. P.—Lost Opportunities ... 49
Kitchin, Very Rev. G. W., D.D.—The Inwardness of the Spiritual Life 229
Lang, Rev. J. Marshall, D.D.—Our Parliament and Country 208
Lightfoot, Rev. John, M.A., D.Sc.—Science and Faith 109
Napleton, Rev. John—Health Preservation: A Religious Prescription 87
Napleton, Rev. John—Lessons from the Hiring Fair 277
Newbolt, Rev. W. C. E.—The Dawn of Christianity 173
One of the Clergy of St. Anne's Church, Dublin—Salvation in Christ's Attributes 123
Panter, Rev. Charles Richard, M.A., LL.D.—The Wisdom of Self-Communion 73
Plummer, Rev. A., D.D.—The Conditions of Divine Progress 37

SERMONS BY :— PAGE

Rawstorne, Rev. W. E., M.A.—The Kingdom of God... 232
Rawstorne, Rev. W. E., M.A.—The Reflex Effect of Christian Missions 241
Reid, Rev. J.—The Great "In Memoriam" ... 76
Reid, Rev. J.—A Look at Home 157
Roberts, Rev. W. Page, M.A.—The Doctrine of Angels 39
Robinson, Rev. J. Armitage, B.D.—The Unity of Life in Christ 265
Scott-Holland, Rev. Canon H.—The Name of Jesus 13
Silvester, Rev. James, M.A.—Looking unto Jesus 28
Silvester, Rev. James, M.A.—The Second Death... 121
Silvester, Rev. James, M.A.—Secret Prayer ... 220
Sinclair, Ven. William Macdonald, D.D.—The Secret of Unselfishness 61
Sinclair, Ven. William Macdonald, D.D.—Christ the Way 169
Welldon, Rev. J. E., D.D.—Worldliness 193
Wilkinson, Right Rev. G. H., D.D.—Difficulties in Evangelistic Work: And how to Deal with Them... 5

SERMONS ON :—

The Perfection of Love—By Rev. Canon Duckworth, D.D. 1
Death of Sin, Death to Sin—By Rev. Sir George W. Cox, Bart. 4
Difficulties in Evangelistic Work: And how to Deal with Them—By Rev. Right Rev. G. H. Wilkinson, D.D. 5
The Name of Jesus—By Rev. Canon H. Scott-Holland 13
The Race set before us—By Rev. Sinclair Carolin, M.A. 16
Until His Coming Again—By Rev. W. T. Hobson 25
Looking unto Jesus—By Rev. James Silvester, M.A. 28
The Conditions of Divine Progress—By Rev. A. Plummer, D.D. 37
The Doctrine of Angels—By Rev. W. Page Roberts, M.A. 39
Lost Opportunities—By Rev. O. L. S. P. Jenkins... 49
Shutting the Gates of Derry — By Rev. M. B. Hogg, B.A 50
The Secret of Unselfishness—By Ven. William Macdonald Sinclair, D.D. 61
The Wisdom of Self-Communion—By Rev. Charles Richard Panter, M.A., LL.D. 73
The Great "In Memoriam"—By Rev. J. Reid ... 76
The Power and the Glory—By Ven. Archdeacon Farrar, D.D., F.R.S. 85
Health Preservation: A Religious Prescription—By Rev. John Napleton 87
The Tabernacle of God with Men—By Bishop of Wakefield 97
Science and Faith—By Rev. John Lightfoot, M.A., D.Sc. 109
The Second Death—By Rev. James Silvester, M.A. 121

283.05
CHU
V.35

SERMONS ON :— PAGE

Salvation in Christ's Attributes—By one of the Clergy of St. Anne's Church, Dublin 123
Words of Consolation—By Ven. Archdeacon Farrar, D.D., F.R.S. 133
The Cry of Irish Protestantism—By Rev. J. A. Carr, LL.D. 136
The Temptation of Jesus—By Rev. Canon Duckworth, D.D. 145
Our Seamen as Missionaries—By Rev. William Gunter, B.A. 148, 160
Definite Prayer—By Rev. H. H. Tilney Bassett ... 150
A Look at Home—By Rev. J. Reid... 157
Christ and Other-Worldliness—By Rev. W. A. Cutting 163
Christ the Way—By Ven. William Macdonald Sinclair, D.D. 169
The Dawn of Christianity—By Rev. W. C. E. Newbolt 173
Influence of Christianity in the Heart, in the Home, and in Society—By the Archbishop of Dublin... 181
Worldliness—By Rev. J. E. Welldon, D.D. ... 193
The Certainties of an Apostle—By Rev. George Bladon, B.A. 195
The Resurrection of the Body—By Bishop of Gloucester and Bristol 205
Our Parliament and Country—By Rev. J. Marshall Lang, D.D. 208
Salvation from Death By Rev. W. T. Hobson ... 217
Secret Prayer—By Rev. James Silvester, M.A. ... 220
The Inwardness of the Spiritual Life—By Very Rev. G. W. Kitchen, D.D. 229
The Kingdom of God—By Rev. W. E. Rawstorne, M.A. 232
The Reflex Effect of Christian Missions—By Rev. W. E. Rawstorne, M.A... 241
Christ's Love as a Motive—By Rev. Robert Eyton, M.A. 245
Fitness for Service—By Ven. David Howell, B.D... 253
How "Christ Died for our Sins according to the Scriptures"—By Rev. W. T. Hobson... ... 256
The Unity of Life in Christ—By Rev. J. Armitage Robinson, B.D. 265
Human Affliction Divinely Shared—By Rev. M. B. Hogg, B.A. 269
Lessons from the Hiring Fair—By Rev. John Napleton 277
The Risen Jesus—By Rev. M. B. Hogg, B.A. ... 280
Spirit-Rays—By Rev. Sinclair Carolin, M.A. ... 289
The Influence of the Holy Spirit on Character—By Rev. William Gunter, B.A. 290

TEXTS TO SERMONS :—

Genesis i. 26 109
Genesis ii. 7 ... ... 87, 109
Deuteronomy xxxii. 47 208
2 Kings xx. 14, 15 157
1 Chronicles xix. 13 61
2 Chronicles xx. 15 136
Psalm vi. 6 ... ... 133, 181
Psalm xviii. 2 50
Psalm lxxvii. 19 148
Psalm cvii. 23, 24 160
Ecclesiastes i. 16 73
Isaiah lxiii. 9 269
Isaiah xlix. 1, 2, 3 253
Matthew iv. 1 145
Matthew vi. 6 220
Matthew vi. 10... 39
Matthew vi. 13... 85
Matthew vi. 24... 277
Matthew vii. 22 49
Matthew viii. 10-12 241
Matthew xx. 16... 163
Mark ix. 10 205
Mark x. 51 150

TEXTS TO SERMONS :— PAGE

Mark xvi. 6 280
Luke ii. 21 13
Luke ix. 60 232
Luke xvii. 21 229
Luke xxiv. 34 173
1 John v. 18-20 (R.V.) 195
John viii. 51 217
John xiv. 6 169
John xv. 5 265
John xvi. 12 37
John xix. 36, 37 256
Acts xix., part of 2 290
Romans vi. 23 4
1 Corinthians i. 21 123
1 Corinthians vi. 19 289
1 Corinthians ix. 24 16
1 Corinthians xi. 26 ... ... 25, 76
2 Corinthians v. 14 245
Philippians i. 9, 10 1
Hebrews xii. 2 28
Revelations xxi. 3 97
Revelations xxi. 8 121

LEADING ARTICLES :—

1892—1893 9
The Hat Trick 18
The Poor Clergy 31
Professor Thoulet on Scientific Warfare 32
Revolution, Revelation 42
Evening Communion 53
A Welsh Rare-Bit 64
Clergy Fees 80
Here we are Again 89
The Lincoln Judgment 101
A Protest 113
How we are Governed... 126
Church Patronage 139
Clerical Pirates... 152
For the Irish Loyalists... 153
The Holidays 165
Sir E. Hornby on International Arbitration .. 165
The Public-house Plunder Bill 177
Hoist with his own Petard 177
Trade Unionism 188
Misguided 198
The Russian Terror 199
An Apologetic Bishop... 210
A "Hardy Annual" 211
Dissent as a Spiritual Force 222
This Picture—and This 236
Disendowment a National Loss 248
Prebendary Eyton and the "Welsh Church" ... 259
Senile Vanity 272
Suspended 273
Pecksniff 283
Riding for a Fall 284
Ecclesiastical Fees 294
The Priest in the Parish 295

PAPERS :—

Divine Eclecticism—By Rev. M. B. Hogg, B.A. ... 32
The New Inferno 44
The Church and the Bodily Health—By Rev. F. Lawrence 46
Of the Divine Method of Promoting Holiness—By R. T. Armstrong 54
Hypocrisis 65
Some *Hapax Legomena* of the Prophet Isaiah—By Rev. O. F. S. P. Jenkins 81
The Irish Home Rule Bill—By Philip Dwyer, A.M. ... .90, 102, 114, 127
The Name "Jehovah"—By R. C. W. Raban ... 104
A Glimpse at the Old Catholics—By Eleanor F. Cobby 115
Aims—By Rev. E. Vere Hodge, M.A. 129

988269

PAPERS :— PAGE

Evening Communion 140
Good Resolutions—By Rev. E. Vere Hodge, M.A. 154
Mr. Mivart's Rejoinder 212
Lay Preaching—By Thomas Heath 237
Memory—By Daisy St. Aubyn 261
Nonsense—By Daisy St. Aubyn 284
The Tongue Aflame.—Exposition of Acts ii. 2, 3—
—By Rev. M. B. Hogg, B.A. 296

REVIEWS AND NOTICES :—

"*The Expository Times*" 20, 69, 105, 178, 238, 285
"*The Expositor*" ... 20, 69, 130, 178, 237, 284
"The Sermon Bible." Vol. X. 69
"Conversations of Dr. Döllinger," recorded by Louise von Kobel... 92
"St. Ignatius and St. Polycarp"—By Ven. Archdeacon Farrar 105
"The People's Bible." Vol. XVIII.—By Rev. Joseph Parker, D.D. 105
"Outlines of Textual Criticism applied to the New Testament"—By C. E. Hammond 106
"Light and Truth." A Record of Church Reformation Work in Spain, Portugal, etc.—Edited by Rev. H. E. Noyes, D.D. 155
"Marriage and the Relation of the Sexes." An Address to Women by the Marquis of Queensberry 166
"*The Thinker*" 178, 238 285
"Address and Meditations for a Retreat"—By Very R. W. Randall, D.D. 189
"The Handy Guide to May Meetings" 190
"A Garland of Thorns"—By Daisy St. Aubyn ... 237
"The Cambridge Companion to the Bible" .. 238
"Texts and Studies." Vol. I., No. 1. "The Apology of Aristides"—By Rev. J. Rendell Harris and Rev. J. Armitage Robinson ... 261
"Lectures on Ecclesiastical History." "The Apology of Aristides"—By Rev. J. A. Robinson 261
"Lectures on Ecclesiastical History." "The Life and Times of Justyn Martyr"—By Rev. F. Meyrick 274

CORRESPONDENCE :—

Inspiration, Exclusive or Not? ... 9, 47, 117, 201
The Kingdom of God and of Heaven 10, 21, 47, 59, 83, 93, 119
The Diocese of Brisbane 11
The Temptation in Eden 20, 34, 70
Unlimited Discretion 23
Supralapsarians and Sublapsarians 58
Divine Eclecticism 71
Hypocrisis 83
What did Socrates Write? 95
Mr. Reid's Sermon 95
Disestablishment in Wales 95
Health Preservation: A Religious Prescription ... 106
The Pages of Socrates... 107
Convocation 107
The Declaration of the Lincoln Judgment 117
The Authorship of the Fourth Gospel 118
ἀδόκιλος... ... ... 131, 155
The Religious Question before the London School Board 143, 249
United Action 143
Training for Cookery Teachers 143
False Doctrine, Heresy and Schism ... 167, 178, 191
Prayer Book Chaunts 179
Marriage 191, 202, 224, 239, 287
Bishop Lightfoot on the Authorship of the Acts ... 203

CORRESPONDENCE :— PAGE

The Church Patronage Bill 203
National Religion 213
Unionism and the E.C.U. 225
What is Christianity? 226, 238
The Welsh Suspensory Bill 238
Disendowment a National Loss 262
The Irish Church 275, 285, 299
The Higher Religious Education of Women ... 285
The Syrian Patriarchate Education Society... ... 286
Polygamy 298

MISCELLANEOUS :—

Church Army Labour Home 8
The New Dean of Peterborough 8
Clergy Discipline Act.—Election of Lay Assessors... 11
Universities' Mission to Central Africa 11
Sanitary and Burial Beform 18
Testimonial to Principal Owen 30
Church of England Sanitary Association ... 42, 79
Resignation of Canon C. W. Bardsley 52
Installation of the New Dean of Peterborough ... 52
Funeral Reform 71, 131
Memorial to the Late Professor Hort 100
The Church in Wales 125
Church Congregational Music Association 129
Resignation of the Rev. Dr. Luke 131
Suggestive Outlines for Pulpit and Desk, for Teachers and Lay Workers 138, 155 164, 179, 187, 200, 214, 226, 235, 251, 262, 282, 293
Lord Grimthorpe and the Burial Reform Association... 155
Presentation to the Bishop of British Columbia ... 166
Temporary Retirement of Canon Cross 172
Grants by the Ecclesiastical Commissioners ... 176
The Bishop of Oxford and the Rev. J. B. Higham 179
The Rochester Diocesan Conference... 179
The Diocesan Sunday Fund 179
Jubilee of the Church of England Young Men's Society 207
Poor Benefices 210
The Church Congress 214
The University of Edinburgh and Women Graduates 214
Death of the Right Rev. J. F. Turner, D.D. ... 215
Interesting Discovery at Cambridge 215
Clergy Distress Fund 215
Sudden Death of Professor Bensley 215
Russia and the Stundists 215
The Pusey House 215
Death of Mr. Henry Pearson Gates 219
Proposed Employment of "Cavalry Curates" ... 227
Opening of the Organ at Faversham Church ... 250
Polytechnic Trips to the World's Fair, Chicago ... 250
The Restoration of Stainburn Church 251
Offertory Results at All Saints', Notting-hill ... 251
Mr. Huxley's Romanes Lecture at Oxford 251
Lord Halifax and the Welsh Suspensory Bill ... 263
Birmingham Church Congress 263
Village Club Feast and the Landed Interest ... 272
Duval Restaurants for London 275
The Dean of Peterborough and the Oddfellows ... 275

PREFERMENTS AND APPOINTMENTS 11, 24, 35, 48, 60, 71, 84, 95, 107, 119, 131, 144, 156, 167, 180, 191, 203, 215, 228, 239, 252, 263, 276, 287, 300

CLERICAL OBITUARY 12, 24, 36, 48, 60, 72, 84, 96, 108, 120, 132, 144, 156, 168, 180, 192, 204, 216, 228, 240, 252, 264, **276, 288,** 300

The Church of England Pulpit
AND
ECCLESIASTICAL REVIEW.

VOL. XXXV.—No. 889. SATURDAY, JANUARY 7, 1893. [PRICE ONE PENNY.

The Church of England Pulpit.

THE PERFECTION OF LOVE.

BY REV. CANON DUCKWORTH, D.D.

SERMON PREACHED IN WESTMINSTER ABBEY.

"And this I pray, that your love may abound yet more and more in knowledge and in judgment; that ye may approve things that are excellent."—PHILIPPIANS i. 9, 10.

WE heard these words a few days ago in the course of our daily lessons, when reading through one of those four extant letters which were written by St. Paul during his captivity at Rome. It is the happiest of all the Apostle's writings — the happiest, although it belongs to a period of the utmost anxiety and peril, for it arose directly out of one of the few bright incidents which relieved the dreary uncertainties of his position. He had just received touching proof of the loyal affection of his Macedonian converts, one of their leading presbyters, Epaphroditus, having brought to him the fourth contribution by which the Church of Philippi had ministered to his necessities. At Rome St. Paul, with fettered hands, was unable to work, as he had done elsewhere, for his own living. We might, perhaps, have thought that the members of the local church —some, for example, of those brethren who, not long before, had gone as far as Appii Forum to greet him and attend him on his way to the capital —were numerous and wealthy enough to save the captive Apostle from the wearying degradation of money cares. Possibly there may be an allusion to their coldness and selfishness in those words which we find in the second chapter of the epistle, where he tells the Philippians that he has nobody beside him to be compared for loving disinterestedness with Timothy: "for all," he adds, "seek their own." Selfishness, that is, is the prevalent temper of those with whom we have to deal here.

It was an additional source of sorrow to him that even in the Roman Church the party spirit of the Judaizers and others was so bitter that some were preaching Christ of strife and envy. Nothing but St. Paul's splendid magnanimity could have enabled him to bear this trial. It was, indeed, something that in any way and with any motive the name and the Gospel of Christ should be made known. It was being made known in the best of all ways, by the courage which his bonds inspired, and by the intercourse with the Prætorian soldiers which those bonds involved. "In every way," he says, "whether in pretence or in sincerity, the story of Christ is being told; and therein I rejoice, yea, and I will rejoice."

Amid neglect and opposition, and in misery, St. Paul felt all the more deeply the kindness of one staunch and generous community. And so he opens his heart to them. He pours forth the tenderest greetings and devoutest wishes, together with details of the most pathetic interest regarding his own prospects and feelings. He is lavish in praise of those absent friends. The thought of their steadfastness is the greatest solace he has. He has no disorders to rebuke, no heresies to correct, no gross sins to denounce. The only hint of disapproval in the letter is due to some petty mischief fostered by two female converts of influence, Euodias and Syntyche. Otherwise the Apostle writes with overflowing gratitude and cheerfulness of the state of the church he is addressing.

When we study the opening prayers and thanksgivings in his epistles, we notice that it is St. Paul's habit invariably to thank God for what is strong in the church for which he writes, and to pray for a supply of that in which it is weak. Thus in the passage before us he thanks God for the enthusiasm and generosity of the Philippians, and he prays for their advance in knowledge, perception, and judgment: that is to say, in what may be called the more intellectual and thoughtful elements of Christian character, for which they, and perhaps the Macedonian churches generally, were less conspicuous. There is a marked contrast between the prayer of the text and the thanksgiving which in to-day's epistle he tells the Corinthians he was continually offering for them. They abounded in gifts, they were strong on the intellectual, weak on the moral side of their faith; and therefore, while St. Paul thanks God for their richness in all utter-

ance and in all knowledge, he exhorts them to cultivate the graces in which they were lacking to grow in unity and in humility of mind.

Let us, then, examine the prayer which the Apostle offers on behalf of the Philippians, those beloved converts whom, as he says, he had continually in his heart, and the remembrance of whose graces gladdened him in the darkest hours of his great fight of afflictions. "This I pray, that your love may abound more and more"—literally, "that your love may overflow"—that having first filled the heart, it may, as it were, run over into your intelligence. It is as though he would say to them: "Love is your strong point, I thank God for it. I pray that it may become ever stronger, and that the redundant strength of it may be diverted into other parts of character, so that you may be reinforced in spiritual understanding, in perception, in the power of testing or discerning the things that are of transient excellence."

The prayer is one of singular thankfulness and beauty. It helps us to understand how wise and discriminating a teacher St. Paul was. Nobody could know as well as he knew where the strength of his converts lay. He had had ample proof of their love. He had enjoyed many a token of their sympathy, and now no better wish could he offer them than this: that the grace in which they excelled might be still further developed, that it might take wider range, that it might quicken new faculty. The word he here uses for "knowledge" is one specially fitted to the context, a compound word signifying knowledge which has grown from more to more. The verb corresponding to it is employed by him in 1 Cor. xii.: "Now I know in part, but then shall I know as also I am known." In the first clause in that well-known verse, where he is speaking of present knowledge, he employs the weaker word; but in the latter clause, where he is speaking of complete knowledge in store, he uses the intenser; and thus in the prayer for the Philippians he desires for them the gift of a progressive spiritual intelligence.

And more than this, he prays for "all judgment"—literally, all perception. He longs to see their love not only giving expansion to their understanding, but imparting to them that sensitiveness of moral touch; that justice of perception, which love always generates when it becomes the pervading influence of a heart and a life. And the end of this is to be that they may not rest satisfied with a spiritual mediocrity, but pursue, and enthusiastically pursue, the highest excellence it is possible to attain; so that when the day of Christ came they might stand unabashed before Him, as faithful servants who had done their best, who had used their opportunities, and improved their gifts, for His sake, to the very utmost.

And this prayer which rose from St. Paul's Roman prison on behalf of the Philippians is one which might well be offered on behalf of every Christian. Love, which is the root of all excellence, the condition and essence of all discipleship, is not intended to remain a mere emotion, still less a mere sentiment. It is to be a practical power, a spirit leavening all capacity, a generator of light to the understanding as well as of warmth to the heart. He who loves Christ more and more, and learns to love his brethren for the sake of Christ, will not indulge in any vague affection. The Spirit by whom that love is shed abroad will sooner or later prove His presence by that right judgment in all things to which the Apostle longed to know that his converts were attaining. It will stir him to outgrow imperfect service, to enlarge the bounds of his knowledge, to elevate the range of his ideas, to become quick-sighted and inventive, to think out and to practise more effectual ways of witnessing for Christ in the world.

But it is only the few who seem to cultivate this desire "to grow in grace and to abound more and more." Most of us, brethren, are prone to spiritual indolence, well satisfied if we have formed certain respectable habits, if we have acquired a small modicum of rudimentary religious knowledge. Instead of thirsting for new light and rejoicing in it, are we not rather apt to resent the suggestion that we require it? We have not thought of revising the little we do know, of unlearning what is untenable and assimilating new truth, no hearty desire to forget the things which are behind, the imperfect service and the small attainments of the past, and to press forward in Christ's name to higher and harder things. Men think much of the distinctions that part them from each other, and make much of differences which are often quite superficial, but in truth there is no distinction in the world more marked and important than that which exists between the progressive and the unprogressive, between those who are content to stand still and those who are ever seeking to advance, between those who, as the author of the Epistle to the Hebrews says, linger in their babyhood and require to be fed with milk, and those who have gone on growing until they can digest strong meat, and by reason of use have their senses exercised to discern good and evil.

But, again, the prayer of the Apostle may be taken as a vindication for the Gospel of Christ of its capacity to develop and adapt itself to the needs of Society. For the order of Society is as truly of God as the Gospel of Christ itself. Since the days of our Lord, Christianity has undergone at least one transformation so complete that a hasty observer might fancy that it had been altogether destroyed. That change is due to the fact that at one time it was opposed by the State, whereas now it is countenanced by it. Formerly it was both scorned and dreaded, whereas now it is a recognised influence in the social system of every civilised people in the world. We turn to the words of Christ, and we cannot blind ourselves to

this peculiarity which attaches to almost the whole of them, namely, that they were spoken to men who were destined to live in the midst of hardship and poverty and persecution, ending as often as not with the martyr's death. But in these days it is rare indeed for anybody to suffer for being a Christian. Persecution, once the rule, is now the exception. And again, nearly everything that Christ uttered presupposes that his followers would have to break away from the world, to decline its objects, to spurn its prizes. Now we look around us and we see men who own Christ as their Master filling their lives with earthly interest, using the world without misgiving, seeking its employment, enjoying its reward. The Church is seen, in fact, to be standing no longer outside Society as at the first, no longer rejecting and condemning it, but entering into it and claiming it for Christ. In the words of one of our most thoughtful teachers, "If the necessities of our condition, with all the light thrown upon them by long experience, are no evidence of God's purposes, we are indeed in darkness. If they are, it is plain that man both the individual and the race, has a career here, that he has been furnished for it—I need not say how amply—and was meant to fulfil it." Yes; it has been made plain enough that Christianity is intended for a wider purpose than was visible at first, and it is equally plain that Christianity has been transformed no less than Society by the change which has taken place in their mutual relations. I do not mean, of course, that it has been transformed in its essential character, for this can never change. But in the manner in which this essential character is manifested. Love is, and ever must remain, the essence of Christianity, but love has taken new, has taken unforeseen directions. Under the guidance of the Holy Spirit of God, it has "abounded more and more in knowledge and in all judgment."

And can we suppose that we have seen the end of this development? Is practical Christianity, think you, to be stereotyped henceforth in its working, to be incapable of adjusting itself to the varying wants of civilisation which, even within our own memory, has presented new and bewildering problems to heart and intellect alike? Think of the morality taught by Jesus Christ! In one sense, unquestionably that morality was perfect—it was perfect in its fundamental principles. The Golden Rule announced by Him, so far as we can see, is final and unalterable, equally adapted for time and eternity, for angels and for men. But what are the methods of carrying out that rule? These must differ; these must undergo change, as love comes to abound more and more in delicacy of perception, as men devise new expedients, and develop increased power to appreciate things that are excellent. Only to take one familiar instance of what I mean. How much we find in the Gospel about the permanent duty of relieving the poor! It is a duty laid down there in unqualified language: "Give to him that asketh of thee; sell that thou hast and give to the poor." No cautions are added in regard to the recipients of our charity. Little or nothing is said about the necessity of preventing the distresses to which Christians are urged to minister, and it is easy to see why. To these first disciples the work of relief was obvious and intelligible enough. But the work of prevention presented problems which they were incapable of solving, if not incapable of comprehending. But these, need I say, are the problems with which our age has to deal. And thus you find one of the most brilliant exponents of modern Christianity using language like this: "No man who loves his kind can this day rest content with waiting as a servant upon human misery when it is in so many cases possible to anticipate and avert it. Prevention is better than cure, and it is now clear to all that a large part of human suffering is preventable by improved social arrangements. Charity will now, if it be genuine, fix upon this enterprise as greater, more widely permanent and beneficial, and therefore more Christian than the other. When it has done all that the New Testament enjoins, it will feel that its task is not half fulfilled."

More and more men have come to feel that the true enthusiasm of humanity, the grand motive power of all efforts to ameliorate the lives of men, must be found in the law of Christian love. True, it is the first function of the Church of Christ to make men better, but no less truly is it her duty to make them happier. And just as in the first days the Church assumed this function in its simplest and most primitive form, actually calling into existence one order of the ministry for the express purpose of "serving tables," so she must maintain it under all changes of social condition, utilising all experience, abandoning methods which have ceased to answer, and adopting whatever agency gives best promise of coping with the dangers and disorders of the time. There are those—and have we not perhaps known some such, in whose case the prayer of St. Paul seems as if it had been completely answered?—whose love as it has grown from more to more has seemed to animate their intelligence and to give them a wondrous instinct for detecting all that is right and wise and true, all that is sovereign and adorable in the lives and characters which come in contact with their own. Nothing is there in the world so heavenly as this refining process of Christian love, prophetic, wherever we see it, of that final transformation when those whose heart's desire it has been to grow in likeness to Christ here shall be satisfied: they shall be like Him, for they shall see Him as He is!

THE Bishop of Nottingham (Dr. Trollope) has now been rector of Lessingham, Sleaford, for half-a-century.

DEATH OF SIN, DEATH TO SIN.

By the Rev. Sir GEO. W. COX, Bart., Rector of Scrayingham, York.

Sermon Preached at Scrayingham.

"The wages of sin is death."—Rom. vi. 23.

EACH time that a familiar face disappears from among us, each time we are told of a friend or a neighbour that his voice can be heard among us no more, we must, if we ourselves are going down hill in the journey of life, feel that our turn for disappearance must soon come. "A few more struggles here, a few more partings o'er," and then we ourselves shall become a memory to those whom we have loved, or who have loved us. In almost all cases the thought of those who have gone before us becomes more tender than the feeling which we had for them while they were here. We dwell on all the good that we have seen in them, while their faults, their mistakes, their wrong doings become constantly more faint, if they are not forgotten altogether.

Beyond all doubt we feel that a great change has come over them, and we know that in the same way the same great change will pass over ourselves. We look forward to this change with very mingled feelings, which differ widely at different times. Sometimes we shrink from it, sometimes we think that we are resigned to it, and sometimes we may almost long for it. There is much about it which perplexes us, and much, too, which depresses and discourages us. There is no use whatever in shutting our eyes to the fact, or in fancying that we know things which we do not know and which we have no means of learning. Life is wonderful, most wonderful, and in truth absolutely incomprehensible. We think ourselves familiar with the conditions of our present life, and this seeming familiarity leads us to imagine that we know something about them. Of the conditions of the life to come we know absolutely nothing; but I do not say this in order that I may lead you to look on the change which leads to it less hopefully and less cheerfully, nay, rather I would hope that whatever I may say may lead you to be more cheerful and more hopeful than before. In truth there are a thousand reasons why we should be more resigned and more thankful as we think of it. What we are told about it now differs greatly, sometimes vastly, from what we were commonly told fifty years ago. We took it for granted then that this physical change which we call death was not in the world always, that it came into the world because man chose the evil rather than the good, and that it was, in short, strictly and entirely, the result of human sin. Being such we were told that it was, and we regarded it as a punishment, a penalty, and a curse—a curse which passed upon all, a change to be looked upon with vague dread, if not with sheer terror.

My words during the past years will have been spoken to little purpose, if they have not helped you to fight with these fears and fancies and to conquer them. We are honest men and women, and we wish (so far as our powers and opportunities may enable us) to see things as they are. We have begun to read the great book spread before us, the book of God's creation, and we have traced its records through myriads and myriads of ages which passed away before any being like man trod the soil of this earth. From the first we see this earth as a world in which things have weight, solidity, and therefore resistance. If the thing which has weight falls upon a living thing it will hurt him, or, it may be, crush him. An avalanche falling upon an elephant will bury him alive, or the fire of a forest will burn him to ashes. Is it possible for one instant to suppose that there was, and that there could be, no accident in the world till man had offended against Divine law? Can we for a moment think that water would not drown, or lightning smite, or the earthquake swallow up the living things which come in its way? The record of creation tells us that, as it is now, so it was always; but it also tells us much more. It exhibits to us a long series of living things fighting with each other, preying upon each other. How can we suppose that an animal could be devoured unless its body died?

In fact, this death of the body has been here from the beginning, but it has not come only because some animals are found to live on the flesh of others. It is not the result of violence only. Life here begins with what we all call birth, and then follows growth, the living thing, whatever it may be, assimilating its food to itself, taking up particles of what we call matter into its tissues and its blood, and so gaining strength, power, or beauty. But this is a process which goes on only for a short time. For awhile the animal seems to stand still after it has reached a certain standard of growth, and then its force or power begins very slowly to give way; and what can this process of decay end in, except in the stopping of all this complicated and magnificent machinery?

As we dwell on this question, we must remember that we are dealing with a world of sensible things, which see, or touch, which protect or kill, or, in other words, cherish physical life or put an end to it. We are not speaking of life under other conditions; we are not saying that there may not be conditions immeasurably higher than any with which we are acquainted now and here. But without going further, we have already reached a conclusion which carries with it a wonderful consolation. If that which we call death (meaning by this the death of the body) is simply the consequence of decay, if birth implies growth, and if the increase of vigour, and grace, and beauty,

implies the gradual lessening or weakening of these qualities, then all the terrible fancies with which we have frightened ourselves or have frightened others are seen to be absurd. Death (the death of the body) is no punishment, is no penalty, is no curse. It has nothing whatever to do with human faults or sin. It has come to every living thing in this physical world and in all worlds fashioned like it; and therefore what can it be but a blessing, although for the present it may be hard for us to understand it. It is a blessing, for if there be higher conditions into which we pass, the death of our body is the only way by which we can pass into them. It is a blessing, and therefore we cannot suppose that it was any part of the work of the Eternal Son of God to deliver us from that which is no curse, but is the very opposite of a curse.

Of the actual accompaniments of the change we know nothing, we see only certain effects which follow it, but these do not touch the living being whom we have known and loved. The undergoing of this change or death is a condition from which none living on this earth can be freed, and if we will but only look upon it reasonably, we shall acknowledge that it is one from which we ought not to wish to be freed.

But is there not then a death which we ought to dread, and deliverance from which must be the consummation of the Divine work in the world? It is marvellous, indeed, that on such a subject as this we can be so blind, so absurdly bent on substituting fictitious terrors for that which indeed we have cause to fear. There is this death, awful beyond the powers of our mind to imagine or to realise fully; and it is the death of sin, the death to which man may bring himself through the sickness of disobedience, through the plague of sin. It is the death which we begin to approach, when we are led away by our own lust and enticed. We plunge into this death when this lust runs on into sin, and when sin has done its deadly work. This death is here and now, as well as hereafter, the wages of sin. It is the death which all die in Adam, that is, when we follow the example of disobedience, and obstinately take our own course. It is this death alone which separates us from God, which shuts us out from peace and hope and love, and leaves us in the outer darkness, self-banished from Him in whom alone we can have light and life.

But then of this death, the death of sin, we say that there is indeed a Conqueror; and from this death our assurance is that we are being, and shall finally be, delivered by the love of the Son of God who is dead eternally to all sin. Through this His death to sin; we rejoice to believe that He is the Conqueror of death and sin. As in Adam all die the death of sin, so in Christ shall all be made alive by His death to sin. By this death He opens the gate of deliverance for all. He shall reign until He has put all things in subjection under His feet, and the last enemy which is now being destroyed is death, not the death of the body (which is no penalty and no curse), but strictly and only the death of sin. The destruction of this death (the only death which we have to dread), is His eternal work; and the blessed consummation, when even this awful death will have been conquered and extinguished, shall most assuredly be brought about. It is for this that the Father has given Him a Name that is above every name, that at the Name of the great Healer every knee shall bow, and every tongue confess that He is Lord to the glory of God the Father.

DIFFICULTIES IN EVANGELISTIC WORK: AND HOW TO DEAL WITH THEM.

BY THE RIGHT REV. G. H. WILKINSON, D.D., LATE BISHOP OF TRURO.

AN ADDRESS DELIVERED TO THE OFFICERS OF THE CHURCH ARMY, AT THE TRAINING HOME IN EDGWARE-ROAD.

THIS morning I gave an opportunity to the officers and nurses present, who were about to labour in the Lord's vineyard, to ask questions which I promised to answer this afternoon if time permitted. You must remember, however, that I am only advising you, as far as I am able, trusting to God to overrule mistakes. I have no authority, for you are not in my diocese; but I will help you as far as I am able. From time to time questions will arise for which you must appeal to God's guidance and your own common sense to deal with adequately; in any case your own pastor will be ready to help you if you ask him.

Some one asks, "How shall we deal with the sins of ignorance and uncharitableness and hatred towards God?" You must, of course, try to bring the offender to a true knowledge of God's goodness. Lead the mind to bear upon His blessed forgiveness of sins which is pledged to us at our baptism if we believe in Jesus Christ. That is the foundation; on it has to be built up the whole spiritual fabric—the duty to God and to man as embodied in the Ten Commandments, and then the glorious sacrament of the Body and Blood of Christ. Having proceeded thus far, be careful not to put a stumbling-block in the way of a waking believer; you know Christ's severe commentary upon such offenders. But suppose you are repulsed with the words, "What right have you to preach to me about these things?" what are you to do? The best plan is to be very humble, and to apologise if you have been rude or aggressive, remembering that we all belong to one army, and that anything in which one soldier does wrong affects the whole of his comrades in Christ.

Having begged pardon, ask permission to pray, and then speak a few simple words to God. Don't pray at the person you are dealing with, calling him a wicked creature, and that you hope his eyes may be opened to see the sinfulness of his ways. Be short; and don't enter into a long rigmarole concerning your own sins. After this you can do little more; but it is advisable to keep a note-book; in it you can jot down the name of the person, and then you can occasionally pray for him. Don't, however, allow yourself to be burdened by this. Had I time I could tell you some marvellous conversions through such simple means.

How to Deal with Sceptics.—Some one says, "I have a sceptical brother; how shall I deal with him?" The reply to this will answer many questions which come later. It has often pressed on my mind when I have had the spiritual charge of people who not only knew more than I did, but could argue better than I could, that I was not responsible personally for teaching everybody everything; but I was bound to do what I could to get some one else to instruct them, and smooth away difficulties if possible. To this end I arranged to have a course of lectures delivered every year by a person who knew his subject, and was capable of answering and advising those of his hearers who desired it. Try not to be led into an argument; tell your brother that you found great comfort in religion and in Jesus Christ, and you would like him to gain the same benefits. If he turns round upon you, and asks how do you know it is true that there is a God at all, what makes you believe it, you must be prepared with a good reason for your faith—a reason which really satisfies yourself, and in the efficacy of which you honestly believe. Get some train of thought which has been a real help to your own mind as well as your heart, and say: "It may not help you, but it has me; would you mind kneeling with me and offer a prayer to the God who cannot understand, a prayer something like this: 'O Thou whom Christians call God, if Thou dost live, help me?'" Endeavour to start the man on the right road.

"How are we to deal with those people in whom the spiritual sense seems dead?" To draw a parallel case, you are as one of 8,000 in St. Paul's Cathedral all singing together the Old Hundredth, which is so grand you are almost carried away, and say to a person near "Isn't it glorious?" He stares at you blankly and you find he is deaf; he has not heard a word, but has merely come there to bring his child. Many persons are spiritually deaf. In answer to the question, What are you to do? I can only tell you what I have found useful. About thirty-three years ago we held a mission at Auckland; the missioner had failed us, and we scarcely knew what to do. A crowd of people came to consult us about their souls, and we were anxious to do our best. Those helping in the mission shut themselves in one room and prayed, whilst we went into another and put together four prayers. These prayers I commend to your notice. The first is a petition to God to open our eyes. If you can get your lukewarm brother to use that, even occasionally God will answer it and send him a blessing. If you cannot awake enthusiasm in the man, you can remember him at the throne of grace.

"How to deal with an infidel?" I have already answered that question, but I might make an addition. Get to know some person who has the power of arguing to whom you can refer such a case. There are many men who love to argue a thing out, whilst we may have allowed that power to have become rusty. When any peculiar case arises, do as a medical man would, send your patient off to a specialist.

Selfishness in Religious Work.—Some one says, "My work gives me such intense joy that I feel sometimes I am selfish." Thank God for it; and make a note in your diary of your feelings, so that should evil days come upon you, you will be able to look back with thankfulness and with hope for the future. Our Lord's first miracle was turning water into wine, in order to infuse a simple brightness into the marriage feast. The seventy returned from their mission full of joy. Throughout the Gospels and Epistles constant references are made to this word rejoice, for it is a state of mind which is inculated upon those who accept the blessing of Christ's religion. You have got it, thank God, and make the most of it.

"How about loyalty to a vicar who is not all he should be?" In such a case keep your own counsel, or your opinions might leak out to a friend who never tells anybody but the next person he meets. Pray for your vicar privately, but never speak about it. If you do, another brother tells his wife, and she communicates it to her elder daughter, and then there gradually comes about what God hates and the devil loves—a division in the parish, which is hard, very hard indeed to bear. If you are really in doubt as regards your position in such a matter, write up to headquarters and ask—it is their business, not yours. But remember this one thing, your duty, which is involved in the Ten Commandments, and which our Lord endorsed when He said the first is, "Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart," and the second is like unto it, "Thou shalt love thy neighbour as thyself." You cannot get out of that, and over and over again you will find that it is part of your duty to your neighbour to submit. "Submit yourselves one to another." Yes, you may convert crowds of people, and lead them to Christ, and still bring ruin upon the Church of God by your disloyal words and disloyal thoughts. Dear friends, I don't want to speak strongly, but you cannot be too careful about this.

Games and Amusements.—Now comes a difficult question with regard to social matters.

"Games and Amusements: How far are we to take part in them?" I need only to make one or two general remarks upon this subject. If gambling or betting is carried on in any shape, you must discountenance it. I have gone into the difficulties of the question, and I do not see how any Christian who believes that there is a kingdom of Christ can look upon gambling as anything but an evil. Should gambling exist in the clubs where you are called upon to work, you must send up to headquarters and ask for advice. Avoid Puritanism. I respect Puritans, and am thankful for them; but you know that that word is now used to express a type of men who think that all amusements and all that takes care of the body are wrong. You cannot carry out such a doctrine; you will break down either spiritually, mentally, or physically. Young fellows must have recreation: it is good for them, for it keeps down a great deal of evil of which I cannot speak in a mixed assembly. Therefore, simple amusements and clubs and such like are helps towards a godly life. But don't be involved too much in these yourselves; you can encourage recreations without spending too much of your own time participating in them. You can excuse yourselves on the ground that you have to read your Bible and study in order to teach people adequately. A doctor cannot do many things which are quite right in themselves, simply because he has his patients to attend to, which demand practically all his time, attention, and talents. People will understand and respect your reasons. Only he can succeed who concentrates all his powers upon the work which God has given him to do. Nevertheless, you can show loving sympathy in the amusements of others, whether they be those of a little child or of a grown-up person. I would like to say a little more upon this subject, but time presses.

Preparation for Communion.—"How to get members to prepare for and come to the Holy Communion?" At a conference in Bodmin we were discussing this very question, and asked why so few people came to Holy Communion. A working man rose. He struck a true note. He said, "People do not go to the Holy Communion because their eyes have not been opened. Mine were not open till I attended a mission, and now I love to go to the Holy Table." A man might attend Holy Communion before he is converted, but he will not love it. To expect him to like going is equivalent to putting the cart before the horse. First, by the help of the Holy Spirit you must bring the man to know our Lord, and then tell him the story of our Lord's appointment, or take some beautiful hymn about Holy Communion (there are plenty of them), and talk more about this blessed sacrament. It is so wonderful. Give him the simple teaching which you will find in "First Steps to Holy Communion." Great blessings are to be obtained from Holy Communion. Many people are shy about going, especially through much of the teaching one often hears. But you don't know what Holy Communion is until you get to value it for yourselves. Then out of the fulness of your heart you will be able to persuade others to come as well.

Physical Fatigue.—"Ought we to love those people who do not abstain?" There is no question about the matter. We are commanded to love our neighbours—everybody, in fact.

"When one's physical power is worn out, is it well for God's sake, and for that of one's fellow-creatures, to go on labouring?" Oh! my child, it is very hard for you to know what to do, but if there is a special case you must go on making, or trying to make, an effort. But to feel in such a way is a sign that you ought to have a good doctor. It may have come as a reminder that you are not keeping one day in seven with perfect rest. It is difficult, no doubt, to see others working seven days and apparently getting through more work than we in six. But God's work lasts, lasts unto eternity, and that is done best which is done in submission to His will. When feeling worn out, consider whether you have been taking proper rest; if you have and are still tired, then send for a doctor. Meanwhile, in that particular case your very weakness might help you. There is a tract on "The Power of Weakness" which might comfort some of you in that difficulty.

"Should women speak in the open air?" That question is one of great difficulty to many people, but my answer to it will apply to many other things. You are not responsible. At present tacitly and quietly the Church is allowing women to speak. If you think the Church is wrong, pray for it, and God will guide it aright. Meanwhile, each individual must just take advice from headquarters; they are responsible if you are wrongly counselled; therefore, don't worry about the matter.

"What are we to do about backsliders who have thoroughly disappointed us?" Remember, the effectual fervent prayer of a righteous man availeth much. Commit them to God; put their names in your little note-book, and from time to time pray and think about them. Don't worry as to whether there is any hope, but leave the result with God.

Depression.—Several questions have been asked to this effect: "Nearly every Sunday I have a sense of depression and a desire to be alone. I go out very reluctantly. How am I to treat that?" Then, again, "Many condemn me because I am not so enthusiastic as others. I have a want of intense love for God, which makes me wonder if He has really called me." Never let Satan come as an Angel of Light to disturb you. If you are miserable because you do not love God He counts that as though you were loving Him with your will, and He will pour down upon you more and more of that Divine love. Never let Satan persuade you

to give up your work because you feel that you are not sufficiently enthusiastic. Remember that temperaments differ. Were every one ultra-enthusiastic I suspect that the Church would have been brought to ruin ere this. Our only hope is that the two classes of people be well balanced. Christ is the Head, "from whom the whole body fitly joined together, and compacted by that which every joint supplieth, according to the effectual working in the measure of every part, maketh increase of the body unto the edifying of itself in love." Some are not enthusiastic, but they last longer as a rule, and therefore help the good work quite as much as their more ardent brothers. But here again I am rather afraid that sometimes all these depressing feelings of yours are the want of prudence about the body, and therefore let me repeat, dear brethren, never be tempted to give up one day's rest in each week. Should you get spiritually cold and dead and lifeless, ask if it cannot be arranged for you to have, say, two nights away from your work, even if it is only to go into the next street. Then spend the time in quiet communion with the Holy Spirit, and offer up that great prayer, "Come, Holy Ghost, my soul inspire." Examine yourselves and try to see where you have been going wrong. Use common-sense methods and God will help you. Remember, revival work is dangerous; carefully guard your inmost thoughts, and see if you have been indulging in any impurity. If you ask, God will show you where you have been wrong; acknowledge it; throw it away; by the help of the Holy Ghost seek for forgiveness through Jesus Christ, and start afresh. Make Christian plans for the future. Do as a man would in a foreign city who wished to get a comprehensive view of a cathedral which is enclosed by houses and shops. He goes to the top of a hill, and from there hardly sees the neighbouring buildings, but obtains a splendid view of the beautiful cathedral, with its transept and chancel and the lines of the cross. After even a day's spiritual refreshment you will go back to your work cheerfully to accomplish it, having on the wedding garment, and filled with the good, new, rich wine of the Gospel of the Kingdom. I would like to leave one text with you. Consider Christ, not merely what He has done and suffered for you, but what He wishes by the Holy Ghost to do in you, what He wishes to make of you, what He wishes you to become. Consider Christ, whatever work comes, whatever temptation comes, whatever disappointment comes. Thank God I have never found a man or woman yet who was in any difficulty but some little bit of Christ's life, or some word of His, supplied the need. So I send you out good, honest, evangelical Churchmen, building on the right foundation the great superstructure that is taught you in the Prayer Book, thanking God for Baptism, Confirmation, and Holy Communion, and all the other gifts He administers. Keep these words before you, "When thou passest through the waters, I will be with thee; and through the rivers, they shall not overflow thee; when thou walkest through the fire, thou shalt not be burned, neither shall the flame kindle upon thee, for I am the Lord thy God, the Holy One of Israel, thy Saviour."

THE Hon. and Rev. J. G. Adderley, of the Christ Church Mission in Poplar, and the Rev. T. C. A. Barrett, rector of Newbold, Chesterfield, are about to join the body of clergy working with Dr. Mason at All Hallows', Barking, and will be open to engagements during the coming Lent.

A *Times* correspondent recently spent a night at the Church Army Labour Home, 72, Seymour-place, and sums up the result of his experience and investigations as follows:—"On the whole, the work done appears to be good; its leading spirits do not claim that it can deal with the problem of the unemployed, or attain invariable success; they do not pretend to accept all comers, but aim rather at judicious selection; they do not pretend not to endeavour to instil religion, but they certainly do discountenance hypocrisy. Finally, they challenge investigation of their accounts, and maintain that for a moderate sum of money, expended with economy, they show good results; and, as far as my judgment goes, I agree with them, being of opinion that, when all is said and done, the clergy of the Church of England ought to be encouraged in social work not less than the enthusiasts of the Salvation Army."

IT was announced on Tuesday last that her Majesty had approved of the appointment of the Rev. William Clavell Ingram, vicar of St. Matthew's, Leicester, and Hon. Canon of Peterborough, to be Dean of Peterborough, in succession to the late Dr. Argles. Canon Ingram is the eldest son of the late Rev. George Ingram, rector of Chedburgh, Suffolk. He graduated from Jesus College, Cambridge, in 1857, and was ordained deacon in 1859 and priest in 1860 by the Bishop of Chichester. For some years he held the post of assistant-master at St. Nicholas College, Lancing. In 1864 he was appointed vicar of Kirk Michael, Isle of Man, and chaplain to the then Bishop (Dr. Powys). These appointments he held until 1874, when he was selected by the late Bishop of Peterborough for preferment to the important parish of St. Matthew, Leicester, in succession to Canon G. Venables. In 1887 the Bishop (Dr. Magee) appointed him to an hon. canonry in Peterborough Cathedral. For nineteen years Mr. Ingram has laboured successfully in the exacting work of his large and poor parish, and has become widely known through his work in promoting the religious education of the young. The Church schools of his parish, in which over 1,000 children are being educated, are excellent examples of what Church schools ought to be, and for many years have maintained a high reputation. Mr. Ingram is also well known as a preacher of great ability. In addition to his annual publications in the interests of religious education, he is the author of various sermons published locally and by the S.P.C.K., and of a volume of addresses entitled "Happiness in the Spiritual Life," which were preached at the special mid-day services held in St. Nicholas Church, Liverpool, during the Lenten seasons from 1887 to 1891.

NOTICES.

All communications respecting the Literary portion of the paper should be addressed to the Editor.
Business communications of every kind should be addressed to Mr. S. Gibbon, at the Church of England Pulpit Office, 160, Fleet Street, London, E.C., to whom cheques and Post-office orders for subscriptions (in advance), three months, 2s., six months, 3s. 6d., twelve months, 6s. 6d., are to be made payable.
The Cases for binding Vol. XXXII. are now ready.

For Health and Immortality.

The Ecclesiastical Review.

SATURDAY, JANUARY 7, 1893.

1892—1893.

LATE, but we trust not too late, are our New Year greetings. To all connected or concerned with the Church of England Pulpit we wish long-continued happiness and prosperity.

The year 1892 has seen many matters of importance brought to a fitting and, we hope, final settlement. The highest ecclesiastical and secular authorities have spoken with decision on many of the contested points of ritual which have long vexed the Church. The conclusions arrived at have not been universally received—how could they? But all who put the spirit before the letter will at least be satisfied that the Church of England is free for ever from any risk of superstitious errors being engrafted upon her ceremonial. The most elaborate and impressive affairs of ritual have been judged to be mere picturesque accessories, interesting to the antiquarian and gratifying to the æsthete. Only on these conditions are they to be allowed. There is no doubt that this was not the view taken by many who practised them. There was an attempt to mix the pure source of the Reformation with some amount of doctrinal siftings, not altogether, may be, from Romish springs. It is satisfactory to feel that this is no longer possible, and that the tolerance of what is known as advanced ritual is definite witness to its undoctrinal and virtually useless character.

Increased prospects of peace within the Church are attended by increased prospects of peace outside. A General Election has come and gone, and perhaps the only matter it has settled has been the Establishment of the Church. The cry for Disestablishment, which had been manufactured into first-class popular commotion, has died down into a mere whine. Even in gallant little Wales it has become less loud and long. The professional politicians who worked it for their own ends have left it alone now they have found that the people are beginning to see the difference between party manœuvres and real reforms.

The Voluntary Schools seem to have reached a crisis in 1892. Revision of the Education Acts is bound to come. It is seen that they have been made to serve a purpose never originally contemplated, and that they are being worked to the extinction of the form of education which commends itself to a large number of citizens. We might put up with the injustice of being forced to contribute to schools we do not approve of as well as paying for those we do; but a general protest is being raised against the deliberate attempt now being made to reduce all education to one monotonous level of dreary godlessness.

The year's obituary list is heavy, and contains many names which link our generation with the distant days of the Tracts and other movements of sixty years since. The transition stage, which we are told exists at present, is really well nigh over, and we are on the eve of a new period, to which the giants of the past will be mere memories.

The year 1893 at least promises peace for the Church; the armed camp of Europe is still full of threatening activities, our own political fields as yet promise no harvest except discussions, dissensions, and disruptions. But before the Church there lies a year likely to be free from dangers and disturbances, to be occupied with labours strengthening to herself and of priceless value to her members.

CORRESPONDENCE.

To the Editor of the Church of England Pulpit and Ecclesiastical Review.

INSPIRATION, EXCLUSIVE OR NOT?

Sir,—I do not think that Mr. Donaldson, in his letter of last week, quite understands my position in starting the question of inspiration, whether exclusive or not. He would not, I am sure, misrepresent me if he did. I have no wish whatever to "degrade the Scriptures" to the level which he states. I believe in their superiority over other sacred books, and no word of mine has been uttered to the contrary. The inspiration of their authors is not called in question by my inquiry, but simply its exclusiveness. In addressing myself to men of "sanctified common sense," I purposely wish to exclude men of prejudiced and narrow views, who mentally build up a Chinese wall of exclusiveness round the religious system which satisfies them; and, if perchance, they look beyond, it is only with the scorn of self-satisfaction. G. H. Lewes, in his "History of Philosophy," tells a story of a student, in the Middle Ages, who detected spots in the sun, and communicated his discovery to a worthy priest. "My son," replied the priest, "I have read Aristotle many times, and I assure you there is nothing of the kind mentioned by him. Go, rest in peace; be certain that the spots which you have seen are in our eyes, and

not in the sun." The priest might indeed be sanctified, but he had not the common sense of seeing that nature refused to be tied down to Aristotle. What was the use of the student going to him? I appeal, therefore, to those who, recognising of old that God is the "Father of all," whose thoughts and ways are heavens higher than ours, and not to be measured by them, have, in this age of recovery of many an ancient tablet, hieroglyph, inscription, and sacred book, pondered over the fact of the similarity to their own of religious ideas revealed in them, and asked themselves fairly and squarely the genesis of those ideas. The late Tilney Bassett labelled them as "dreams and delusions." Mr. Donaldson denies, outside the Bible, "any inspiration concerning doctrines beyond the power of human reason to invent or discover," and rather reproves my hardihood in starting the question. Among your many readers and correspondents is there no one who can throw light upon the subject?

There is a view of creation which may be said to pave the way for a wider conception of inspiration. I allude to the doctrine of God's immanence in nature, that higher Pantheism which Mr. Illingworth, in his thoughtful article in *Lux Mundi*, wishes to see restored to its due place in theology. Our thinking faculty is an operation of God, and can only act rightly by Divine assistance. The moralist, *e.g.*, through his devotion and Divine assistance, arrives at ethical truth, his discoveries being, in fact, revelations. So also with religion. Its highest form is Christianity; but long before Christ's advent the Divine Word was ever working in the world, inspiring the higher minds among the Jews with a thirst for holiness, and so preparing the way of the Lord, but inspiring the Greeks also with intellectual eagerness in philosophy for their preparation likewise. "Every soul living under the guidance of reason" (μετὰ λόγου βιώσαντες), says Justin Martyr, "are Christians, even though they were reckoned to be Atheists in their day." St. Augustine tells us that our knowledge of first principles springs from that inner truth that presides over the mind, the eternal wisdom of God, to which every rational soul has recourse; but only so much is revealed to each as his own good or evil will enables him to receive. The conclusion that Mr. Illingworth reaches is, to my mind, the reasonable one, that, antecedent to Christianity, all religious developments were partial and needing completion; but that He, who lighteth every man that cometh into the world, the primæval hunter, the shepherd chieftain, the poets of the Védas and the Gathas, the Chaldean astronomer, and the Egyptian priest, revealed Himself with greater clearness as the willing heart and chosen spirit were ready to receive Him. The history of pre-Christian religion is like that of pre-Christian philosophy—a long preparation for the Gospel. Thus world-wide religious inspiration is one of many manifestations of a fundamental doctrine of Divine immanence in creation:—

> . . . . . "The spirit that impels
> All thinking things, all objects of all thoughts,
> And rolls through all things."

I cannot pretend to say how Mr. Donaldson will accept this view. He may write across it Pantheism and reject it. At any rate it certainly accounts for the wonderful similarity of ideas on religion which prevailed in the ancient world, a similarity which led Max Müller to say, "Of religion, as of language it may be said, in it everything new is old, and everything old is new, and that there has been no entirely new religion since the beginning of the world." It also accounts for the interdependence of Jews an Parsis in angelology and demonology, the former, as is well known, acknowledging that the definite form of their belief was derived from Babylon. I may observe, *en passant*, that I look upon the latter "doctrine of devils" as a concept, impersonating moral and physical evil, and in their leader generalising them. Mr. Donaldson is wrong in asserting that I claim "a real existence for Angromainyush and his evil spirits." I do nothing of the kind. Inspiration is not revelation.

But there are considerations from Scripture itself which point to a wider inspiration than Mr. Donaldson allows. For there we meet with men outside the chosen race who must be acknowledged to be inspired. Early in the history of Abraham, Melchisedec, the Priest-King of Salem, "the priest of the most high God" who was greater than Abraham, since he blessed him, and who was a type of the Saviour, is such a one. Will Mr. Donaldson deny him inspiration? In very early times it appears that small States in the East were ruled by priest-kings, called *patesi* in Chaldea, *Horsheshu* in Egypt, *Makárib* in Arabia. Why should we suppose that Melchisedec, because he happened to rule at Jerusalem over the Jebusites in the lifetime of Abraham, was more holy or inspired than any other priest-king elsewhere, or in another generation? And if we allow them all to be capable of these attributes, why not the wider generalisation?

Then again take the case of Balaam, that soothsayer and enchanter from Aram, a region famous for soothsayers (Is. ii. 6), and the headquarters of Oriental Magi; he was distinctly inspired, heathen as he was and hostile to the Hebrews, and his inspired parable is embodied in Numbers xxiv. Again, it happened to be this particular diviner and enchanter, but the same remark applies to him as to Melchisedec; he represents one of a class, the Magi, and his inspiration might have been that of any other one of his class, called in to curse and remaining to bless, by the King of Moab. Again the faith of the centurion in the Gospel surpassing that of all Israel, or that of the Syro-Phenician woman, or of Cornelius in the Acts, was it by inspiration or not? And if it be allowed that it was of God and therefore by inspiration, then these instances are but samples of the Universal Father dealing with His children, and giving His inspiration to those who earnestly seek Him. St. Augustine says truly: "That which is called the Christian religion really was known to the ancients, nor was wanting at any time from the beginning of the human race, until the time when Christ came in the flesh, whence the true religion, which had previously existed, began to be called Christian."

F. T. P.

THE KINGDOM OF GOD AND OF HEAVEN.

SIR,—Referring to the letter of Mr. Hobson, I thought that I had indicated the reason for thinking that "the kingdom of God" does not mean the same as "the kingdom of heaven." "The kingdom of God is in the midst of you." This is different from the meaning of the kingdom of heaven in the second, third, fourth, and seventh parables of the series in the 13th chapter of St. Matthew. Those parables illustrate an outward kingdom, the subjects of the King being various in their degrees of loyalty. But the first parable, that of the Sower, is applicable to

the reign of God over the hearts of the saints, having plainly that reference. I said that the distinction is not close, though I think it real. The analogy that I draw from the distinction between the Communion of Saints and the Catholic Church does not appear to me objectionable or meaningless. No one will say that those are identical, for then there would be a piece of mere tautology in the creed. Further, Mr. Hobson's view of the matter is not inconsistent with the above, and may be correct, although he advances no reason for it.

January 2nd, 1893. STUDENT.

The translation of ἐντός by "in the midst of" is in the margin of the Revised New Testament.

THE DIOCESE OF BRISBANE.

SIR,—As one of those who responded to the appeal issued by the Bishop of Brisbane, on his appointment, for clergy to go out to his Queensland diocese for a definite term of five years, may I be allowed through your columns to urge the importance and the needs of this particular kind of Mission work? It scarcely seems possible to imagine any more urgent call for workers than that which comes from a rising colony such as this, requiring, in a very special sense, the guidance of Christianity. The inhabitants are ready and willing to give a hearty welcome to the clergy—our Bishop is besieged with letters from all parts of the diocese asking for a clergyman—and yet, besides new ground which has to be left untouched, more than one of our churches are at the present time closed, simply because we cannot get the men.

It seems as if this short service system advocated by our Bishop, and approved of by the Archbishop of Canterbury and others, can alone meet the requirements of this kind of colonial Mission work. And, as a proof of its attraction, of the four who first went out, some six years ago, one is still there, and two others are returning for a second period, so important and urgent does the work seem.

Being in England for a few months, the Bishop of Brisbane has asked me to do my best to bring out some more men. I am myself looking for another assistant for my enormous bush parish, several hundred miles in extent, with five churches, and soon a sixth, to serve, and, at present, two clergy. In these large districts we are anxious to form Mission stations, where three or more single clergy can live together, leading some sort of community life, each one returning from time to time from his travels to the centre.

The work is not only intensely interesting, but the life is most enjoyable and the climate delightful. As the bush work has chiefly to be done on horseback, some knowledge of riding is desirable, but in our town parishes this is not necessary.

I shall be happy to give all the information I can to any who may think of volunteering, or reference can be made to the Rev. Bernard Wilson, rector of Kettering, or to Chancellor Worlledge, of Truro, one of the Bishop's commissaries.

GEORGE J. TATHAM,
Rector of Roma, Queensland.

St. German's, Cornwall, January 2nd, 1893.

IT was stated on Tuesday last that the Bishop of St. Albans is suffering from an attack of rheumatic gout, but was reported to be slightly better.

THE Bishop of Hereford is to be presented next June with a portrait of himself, subscribed for in the diocese, in commemoration of the twenty-fifth year of his appointment to that see.

THE Bishop of Mashonaland (Dr. Knight Bruce) was to have given a special address at Westminster Abbey last Saturday afternoon on "The Influence of Christianity on an African Nation." A very large congregation assembled, but it was announced that the Bishop was too unwell to attend.

THE following have been elected by courts of quarter sessions as lay assessors under the Clergy Discipline Act for two divisions of the diocese of Peterborough:—County of Leicester—Sir A. R. Palmer, Wanlip Hall, Leicester; Mr. Hussey Packe, Prestwold, Loughborough; Captain Pochin, R.N,, Braunstone Hall, Leicester; Mr. R. F. Martin, the Brand, Loughborough; Mr. Thomas Cope, Osbaston Hall, Hinckley. County of Rutland—Messrs. Edward N. Conant, Lyndon Hall, Oakham; Gerald J. Noel, Catmose, Oakham; George H. Finch, M.P., Burley-on-the-Hill, Oakham; Arthur J. Fludyer, Ayston Hall, Uppingham; Richard Tryon, Oakham.

ON Tuesday next a party of nine persons will leave England in connection with the Universities' Mission to Central Africa. Only two of this number have been out before, and the new members comprise one priest (the Rev. T. C. Simpson), one deacon (the Rev. J. Grindrod), one nurse for the hospital in Zanzibar (Miss Basham), one lady teacher for the girls' school in Zanzibar (Miss Garrett), one treasurer's assistant for Zanzibar (Faulkner), and two printers, one for Zanzibar (Russell), and one for Nyasa (Bradshaw). Bishop Hornby will leave Marseilles on February 12th. He will be accompanied by the Rev. J. S. Wimbush, who has been with him two years in Sunderland, and by three laymen. The staff of the mission will be further augmented by the Rev. E. S. Palmer, M.B., St. Saviour's, Leeds; the Rev. G. Du Boulay, assistant priest, Sneinton, Nottingham; and the Rev. A. G. B. Glossop, assistant priest, St. Mary's, Colchester. These additions will bring the number of European workers up to nearly eighty.

PREFERMENTS AND APPOINTMENTS.

Baldwin, Rev. Albert William; Chaplain of H.M. Convict Prison, Portsmouth.
Barton, Rev. James F., M.A., Vicar of Cowick, Selby, Yorkshire; Vicar of St. Michael and All Angels', Shelbrooke, Doncaster.
Bellet, Rev. Auguste; Minister of the French Protestant Church at Holy Rood, Southampton.
Borthwick, Rev. Edwin Rouse, B.A.; Chaplain and Naval Instructor, Royal Navy.
Browne, Rev. William John; Incumbent of Rathlin.
Burn, Rev. John Henry; Rector of Great Cheverell, Wilts.
Crewdson, Rev. George, M.A., Vicar of St. George's, Kendal; Vicar of St. Mary's, Windermere.
Cunningham, Rev. T. S.; Vicar of Christ Church, Whitehaven.
Dawes, Rev. Henry, Curate-in-Charge of Baltonsborough; Vicar of St. Mary's, Frome.
Dickinson, Rev. Francis Wingfield; Rector of Inworth, Essex.
Dyson, Rev. F. J., B.A.; Vicar of Wymynswold, Kent.
Ellerbeck, Rev. Edmund Milnes, M.A.; Vicar of Chipperfield, Herts.
Ethell, Rev. Thomas H., Curate of St. Mary's, Oldham; Curate-in-Charge of the New Mission District and Church in the parish of St. Matthew's, Bolton.
Freeman, Rev. Alexander, M.A., F.R.A.S., Rector of Murston; Rural Dean of Sittingbourne.
Garrett, Rev. Frederick Mills; Rector of Busbridge, Surrey.

Glasspool, Rev. Edwin Thomas, M.A.; Vicar of Garthorpe, Leicestershire.
Grant, Rev. A., Rector and Rural Dean of Queenstown, Diocese of Grahamstown; Archdeacon of King Williamstown.
Harris, Rev. Percy Charles, M.A., LL.D.; General License to Officiate in the Diocese of Rochester.
Herbert, Rev. George, B.A.; Rector of Ganarew, Herefordshire.
Hignett, Rev. Harry Alfred, M.A., Vicar of Bingway and Rural Dean of Bowdon, Cheshire; Honorary Canon of Chester Cathedral.
Holme, Rev. Arthur Phidias, M.A., Vicar of Great Budworth, Cheshire; Honorary Canon of Chester Cathedral.
Hutton, Rev. William Richmond, M.A.; Rector of Lower Hardres, Kent.
Ingram, Rev. William Clavell, M.A., Vicar of St. Matthew's, Leicester, and Honorary Canon of Peterborough; Dean of Peterborough.
Layng, Rev. Thomas, M.A., Second Master of Surrey County School, Cranleigh; Head Master of Royssе's School, Abingdon.
Nightingale, Rev. J. L., M.A., Curate of St. Paul's, Leamington; Vicar of Christ Church, Mountsorrel, Leicestershire, and Chaplain of the Barrow-on-Soar Union.
Nokes, Rev. Arthur John, M.A.; Rector of Upper Clatford, Hants.
Malton, Rev. William Henry Castell, B.A.; Perpetual Curate of St. Matthias's, Sneinton, Nottingham.
Orlebar, Rev. H. A.; Vicar of Silsoe, Beds.
Parker, Rev. William H., Rector of Croghan; Canon of Kirgoghlin in Elphin Cathedral.
Phillips, Rev. Canon Thompson, M.A., Vicar of Ivegill, Carlisle; Vicar of St. George's, Barrow-in-Furness, and Archdeacon of Furness.
Poland, Rev. W. H.; Rector of Shephall St. Mary, Herts.
Preece, Rev. Thomas James; Chaplain of the Cottage Homes, Fazakerly.
Sewell, Rev. H., M.A.; Surrogate for the Diocese of Gloucester.
Somerset, Rev. Henry Plantagenet, M.A.; Rural Dean of Caerleon.
Stewart, Rev. David James, M.A.; Honorary Canon of Ely Cathedral.
Streatfeild, Rev. C. W.; Rector of Stoke Charity, Hants.
Swinstead, Rev. John Howard, M.A.; Missionary of the Society of St. Andrew, and Itinerant Missioner for the Diocese of Salisbury.
Taylor, Rev. Edward; Licensed Preacher in the Diocese of Carlisle.
Tower, Rev. Henry, M.A.; Vicar of Weedon Beck, Northamptonshire.
Turner, Rev. T. H., Curate of East Brent; Curate of St. Helens, and Minister of St. Peter's, Seaview, Isle of Wight.
White, Rev. John, M.A.; Rector of Pitsford, Northamptonshire.
Williams, Rev. Alan, B.A.; General License in the Diocese of Liverpool.
Witts, Rev. F. F. B., M.A., Rector of Upper Slaughter; Surrogate for the Diocese of Gloucester.

CLERICAL OBITUARY.

Abbott, Rev. Arthur Robert, Vicar, at Gorleston Vicarage, Great Yarmouth, on the 27th ult., aged 59.
Bandinel, Rev. James, nineteen years Rector of Elmley, Yorks, at Hulham, Exmouth, on the 31st ult., aged 78.
Boothe, Rev. John Edmund, for thirty-three years Rector of the parish, at Chorlton-cum-Hardy, on the 26th ult., aged 73.
Gibbs, Rev. George Leonard, M.A., Rector of St. James's, Garlickhithe, St. Michael's, Queenhithe, and Holy Trinity-the-Less, London, City, at Cambridge, on the 27th ult., aged 47.
Hookins, Rev. Philip, forty years Vicar of Barford St. Michael, Oxon, at Stockbridge, Whitwell, Isle of Wight, on the 26th inst., aged 89.
Spurgin, Rev. Arthur Dewing, B.A. Camb., for thirty-five years Rector of Gresham, at Gresham Rectory, on the 25th ult., aged 60.
Tower, Rev. Robert Beauchamp, for thirty-seven years Rector of Moreton, at Warley Mount, Brentwood, on the 30th ult., aged 77.
Wolfe, Rev. Arthur, M.A., formerly Fellow and Tutor of Clare College Cambridge, and late Rector of Fornham All Saints-cum-Westley, at Henley Hall, Ipswich, on the 26th ult., aged 73,

MR. EDWARD LLOYD, ENGLAND'S GREATEST TENOR,

Writing to Mr. Harness, 4th July, says:—"Please send me another Electropathic Belt, the same strength as before. Probably you would like to know my opinion and experience of your appliances. Under the advice of a friend who has a thorough knowledge of your inventions, I ordered my first belt with very little faith, having previously tried the ordinary medica remedies without any result. I commenced to wear your belt prior to my visit to America, and felt better from the first day. All through my tour I was remarkably well, and I now feel that I have completely regained my health. I am convinced that this result was achieved by your belt alone. I wish the Electropathic Institution over which you preside every success, and can conscientiously recommend your appliances to my friends.—Yours faithfully,

"(Signed) EDWARD LLOYD.

"To Mr. C. B. Harness, President, Electropathic and Zander Institute, 52, Oxford Street, London, W."

THE COUNTY COUNCIL.—AN IMPORTANT OPINION.

MR. HENRY RITSON, a well-known North-country Solicitor and County Councillor, writes to Mr. Harness from Sea View, Sunderland, May 30th, 1892, as follows:—

"Dear Sir,—I deem it due to you, as well as to the Rheumatic section of the public, to ventilate my personal experience of your system of treatment and appliances.

"For quite thirty years I have suffered more or less from Rheumatism, and especially from Lumbago and Sciatica.

"My severest attack of the latter happened about five years ago, and for the greater part of twenty-two months I suffered excruciating agony, and was practically crippled in my lower limbs.

"I underwent various modes of treatment, including blistering, hypodermic injection of Morphia, Sulphur, and Salt Baths, but I cannot say I experienced anything more from any of them than temporary relief, and not much of that. I had made up my mind that my complaint was chronic and incurable, when I fortunately decided to give your system a trial, and accordingly I personally consulted you and became the possessor of one of your Electropathic Belts, a purchase I have never for a moment regretted. It is three and a-half years since I saw you first; the Belt acted like magic, and I was soon able to discard it, being cured. Since then, whenever I have felt twinges or premonitory symptoms of my enemy, I have retreated within the Belt, and invariably with success as twenty-four or at most forty-eight hours' wearing of it has always been attended with speedy and complete relief. During the whole of this three and a-half years I have not taken a drop or particle of medicine in any form, but have relied entirely upon my Belt.

"I have the greatest pleasure in giving you this testimonial, which, though unsolicited, is thoroughly deserved.—Faithfully yours,

"(Signed) HENRY RITSON.

"To Mr. C. B. Harness, President, Electropathic and Zander Institute, 52, Oxford Street, London, W."

The Church of England Pulpit.

THE NAME OF JESUS.

By the Rev. H. SCOTT-HOLLAND, Canon of St. Paul's Cathedral.

Sermon Preached in St. Paul's Cathedral to the Unemployed, on Sunday, January 1st, 1893.

"His name was called Jesus."—Luke ii. 21.

"WHAT is in a name?" So we are fond of amusing ourselves with asking, in the shallowest and least earnest of our sceptical moods. It tickles our conceit to fancy that we are superior to such an external accident as the form and spelling of a name. And yet human experience and human history are all dead against our light scoff; these proclaim with every tongue the immense significance of names. Of course, it is true that the particular letters to be employed in a name are perfectly immaterial. There is no value in the mere sound; that goes without saying! Any sound you like may be chosen, but it is just the choice that creates the name that the name carries with it wherever it may travel. It is alive with it as with an animate soul, and at every step it accumulates fresh meaning. As it passes from mouth to mouth associations cluster round it, bred out of the situation in which it has been uttered, caught from the very persons who have spoken it, from the look of the letters on the pages, from all the infinite varieties of context with which it has become inwoven. So the name travels, and every separate use of it adds something to its stored suggestiveness.

The power of a name! Men who love know it well, as they fondle and caress the name of the beloved; and men who hate know it equally. For if not, and if a name means nothing, how is it that the moment any cause becomes strong enough to make itself felt those who fear and detest it hasten with all the speed in their power to fasten on it a name that will condemn it? "Give a dog a bad name and hang him," that is a proverb that goes deep. The men who desire to hang the dog know what they are about. The best and easiest way to crush a thing is to stamp it with an odious, ridiculous nickname. That name will carry about with it wherever it goes a libel against the party which it is intended to defame; it will beget contempt; it will seem by its absurdity to carry reason with it; it sets people in arms against the movement as soon as they have become aware of its existence. It wipes out the chance of their pausing to consider what may be said on its behalf; it lands them in a conclusion without having allowed them to hear the premisses. So great is the power of a name. Many a cause never survives the imposition of a nickname; it sinks under the laughter or enmity which is thus evoked against it. The bad name succeeds, and the dog is hung. And, on the other hand, one of the great fascinations of history is to watch a strong and deep movement, which has been met by this enemy, bearing up against the adverse stress which the bad name has brought down upon it, refusing to succumb—nay, adopting the very name of scorn as a badge of its defiance, and bearing it on its flag till victory has purged it of its poisonous intentions, and has transformed it into the dearest title which its adherents can claim or express. "Puritan," "Methodist," "Whig," "Tory"—these are names which have survived the scorn in which they were given, and have become the battle-cries around which men rally.

Human experience verifies thus at every turn the force and reality of a name, and we shall not be surprised, therefore, to find that the Bible, which clings so close to human experience, believes profoundly in names. The name is one of the root words in the Bible from beginning to end, and always it is used to convey the most intense and vivid reality.

And this reality is, in Biblical language, at all events, primarily personal. A person alone can, in the full force of the term, possess a "name," and, so far as we allot names to inanimate things, to hills and to mountains, to cities and rivers, we find that we have practically personified them. Such was "Jerusalem" to the Jew, as he lingered over the name—the scene of "The Virgin Daughter," or of "The Lady of Sorrows," or of "The Bride of Light." A name is a distinctive mark of a person, and the Name of names, therefore, belongs to the Supreme Personality—God. The name of God! "My name shall go before them." "He made the name of the Lord to pass before him." What is it—this Name? It is the innermost parent force of God Himself, in the form in which the force makes itself known and felt abroad, in the scenes of human history. The name of a thing, as we have seen, is that by which it takes its place amid the throng of existence. It is the organ by which its activities tell upon life. So with God. His Name is that in which He issues out from the silence, and thrusts Himself in upon life and lays hold of it and possesses it. It is the power of His will, put out to direct, to control, to govern. It is His inner character, as it displays itself, as it verifies itself, as it exerts itself. The name of God means "God, the personal living God, in action." It is therefore an awful and tremendous presence—masterful, subduing, overwhelming! It is God in His onrush; God in His self-disclosure; God in His high self-assertion. That is the Name! No wonder,

therefore, that when that great Name was first fully declared—the day "when the Lord descended in the cloud, and stood with Moses there, and proclaimed the Name of the Lord. And the Lord passed by before him and proclaimed the Name." And the name was, "The Lord, the Lord God! merciful and gracious, long-suffering, abundant in goodness and truth—keeping mercy for thousands, forgiving iniquity and transgression and sin, yet is just, and who will by no means clear the guilty." No wonder, I say, that under the radiance of the overwhelming presence Moses made haste and bowed his head to the ground, and worshipped the Name of the Lord God.

Now, "His Name was called Jesus!" The name of Jesus! That name is no mere token by which to mark Him from others. The ancient Biblical conception of the "name" prevails here to the full. It is the expression of His universal and most vital work. In that name He plants Himself down as a force in history. Wherever that name travels, whatever book records it; whatever hymns may sing it, whatever stones or marble proclaim it; over every sea, under every sun, down all generations; in every great temple, where it rings in refrain, in psalm and creed song; or in every darkened chamber, where it is whispered in the ears of dying men; in every desolate heart that still, in poverty and pain and terror and bereavement, can recall the familiar accents of that most dear and blessed name—at all times and in all places it carries with it, it seals to man, the presence and power of one identical personality—"Jesus Christ, the same yesterday, to-day, and for ever." In that name He has made it manifest to us what He is and what He would do; by that name He has laid His strong hands on our human story and reversed its direction and re-fashioned its form. And now that name, we say, abides for ever as the sole instrument through which His authority reaches over every man; and all His Church is but the body by which He puts out for ever the vitality of the name, signing it on the forehead, sealing it on the heart—the name of the Lamb of God.

My brethren, is there power still in that name? Has it lost its ancient supremacy? Men, we know, are asking such questions anxiously and piteously, as they look about them on the surface of our earth, that shows but too little evidence of its intention to bow at the name of Jesus, or to place that name above every name. Let us venture to-day to recall at least for our comfort in what manner the mere power of the name is working among us to-day, and how sorely we need its efficacy to prevail yet again, as our forefathers have told us of it. What does it do for us? What is its actual effect to-day?

First, merely as a fact—merely as a memory—the name of Jesus stands behind all who are poor, hungry, outcast, forlorn, and forces them forward into public consideration. He, by being what He was, has made it for ever impossible that the poor shall always be forgotten. Before Him, without Him, though prophets and Psalmists in Israel might lift up lowly voices on behalf of the poor, the world at large could afford to neglect them. It felt no positive demand laid on it to notice them. It had no conscience which required any particular duty towards them. They were there, but it felt no pang in ignoring them, no sting of reproach forbade it to pass by on the other side. These unfortunates had no claims, no rights. They had dropped out of the ranks. The big tide of life swept over them and they sank down, they went under, they lay in the darkness, as those that had been long dead. The disregard of the strong deadened their power to protest; it killed their self-respect. They themselves expected nothing, hoped for nothing; resigned themselves to public contempt, gave themselves over to the tyranny of their own weakness. They had not the least heart to suppose that any one ought to care for how they fared, or that any change would ever dawn for them. Even the Greeks, with their radiant ardour for civic life, never aimed at including within the light of liberty the populations of slaves who had no rights. And if it was so in Greece, where things were fairest, can we even imagine the pathetic hopelessness of those millions of the poor over whom the vast empires of the East—Assyria, Egypt, Babylon—trod with iron heels, those whom no man regarded, and who have left no syllable even to record their suffering or their fate; who went down into the pit in grim, unbroken silence, without a protest, unpitied, unwept, even by themselves? Ah! you are saying, is it not even so to-day with thousands? No; for bad as is our situation, sinful as is our neglect, still that dreadful darkness of the old days is broken; its hideous silence is at an end. Behind the poor is a Name, loud and strong, which compels the world to attend—a Name which forces consideration; a Name which the conscience cannot obliterate or ignore. The Name has, by its unconquerable power, brought the poor up out of the darkness into the daylight. "There they are!" and all men, now, must have eyes to see them, must have ears to hear their cries, "There they are!" and the world can never again go on as if they were not there. It may struggle to forget them, or it may think that, in its hurry and heat, it has no time to notice them. But attend it shall! A voice arrests it, which it dare not refuse. "Here are my poor." Jesus asks, "What are you going to do with them?" And however much the world would like to get rid of the difficulty, there is one retort which it would have made of old, but which is impossible now — the retort, "It does not matter to me; they have no claim upon me; I have no duties towards them." That is what can never now be publicly said by any society which even professes the name of Jesus—of Him who, when

the foxes had holes and the birds of the air had nests, had not for Himself so much as a place on which to lay His head. That is the mighty change worked by this name—merely through the fact of His having lived on this earth and been what He was. He has raised the level at which all discussion of the state of the poor must proceed. He has established a claim for them, which may be compromised or adjourned, but which can never be disputed. And though our present sufferings may disguise from us the full effect of that change, no one can really exaggerate the difference between a state of things when there was no established public conscience to appeal to in the matter of suffering and poverty, and a condition in which, however painful and disastrous it be, there is a moral necessity, which can always be asserted without risk of contradiction, compelling society at large to consider its poor in the name of Jesus—the poor man's friend.

But that name is not only a memory of Him who, by His appearance among men eighteen hundred years ago, created a new conscience. It works not only behind the poor as a memory, but within society as a force, which vindicates for each separate soul its value in the sight of God and man. Each has it in him to become in Him a child of God. It is the name of Jesus which historically has created this estimate of the worth of each individual man, by which each is endowed with his own singular dignity and hope. And what Jesus so created He still asserts. By His unceasing declaration each man has it in him to become by grace a child of God, each has it in him to become a ministering and active member in His living body. And, therefore, in turning the eyes of the social conscience upon the poor, the name of Jesus does not propose merely to leave them poor as a field for Christian charity. Far from it! It compels the social conscience as it gazes upon those masses on whose behalf its attention is forcibly demanded, to break the mass up into separate individuals, each of whom has the same distinct value in the sight of God, and so disentangling each apart to ask again and again of each, with unceasing insistence, "Lord, and what shall this man do?" "Lord, what can he do? What wouldst Thou have him do? This man, and this, and this?" Each might be, and do, something. Each might be lifted from out of the miserable impotence into which poverty sinks him. Each might take his place, and stand in his lot, and find his work, and share in the interchange of healthy social life. Each might, each ought, so far as God's purpose goes. For in the Sermon on the Mount our Lord declares it to be the Father's intention that no one who was loyal to His kingdom and its righteousness should be liable to dire anxiety over his food and clothes for the morrow any more than the birds or the lilies. The lilies are clothed more gloriously than Solomon; the birds are fed. And this by the Father's own care. And men are far more dear to Him than the flowers of the field or all the sparrows under heaven. Let them but seek his righteousness; and He will see to it that all the things they have need of (which He knows so well) will be added unto them. That is the law—the purpose—which He desires to see fulfilled, and, so far as it fails to be realised, the Divine intention is being thwarted by blunders of ours.

Whose are the blunders that thwart? Ah! that is a searching question for us all, poor as well as rich, rich as well as poor. Is it society which refuses the opportunity to the individual man willing to work righteousness, or is it the man who lets the opportunity slip through the failure of his search after righteousness? Each must, if the law is to work out smoothly, be putting out the best that is in him. He must be self-possessed, self-controlled, sober, manly, steady, fair, honourable. He must be one who can co-operate with his fellow-men, and act with them in brotherhood. He must have the social conscience which recognises his membership in a kingdom. He must not be making his own game—loafing in crude uncertainty—without heed to others' interests, recklessly taking any wage he can pick up without looking before or after; in disunion, unassociated, without order, or regularity, or rule. No, for God is a God of order. He has built up a kingdom of law—first in nature, then in grace. They that seek righteousness would work according to the laws of associated work. "Lord," we asked, "what can this or that man do?" Half the answer to the question must be given by the society that is answerable to each for the opportunities it supplies. But half must be made by the man himself. He must be able to do what it is given him to attempt. Able to do it. Able to seek righteousness. Able to be sober, steady, controlled, firm. Ah! but how? That is just the difficulty for so many of us. Seek righteousness and everything else, all will be added; that is the promise of the Father. "Well, but if righteousness is just that which I cannot seek; if I have broken my strength of will and wrecked my self-control, and lost my love of God and cannot care for my brethren, and am weak and reckless and selfish, what then? What, then, is the good of this promise to me? It only serves to mock me in my wickedness, to pin me down to my shame." Exactly; that is it. That is what every one of us must say who has ever sounded the depths of his own soul. And that is why the name of Jesus must not only plead for our poverty by the memory of Him who once with blessed feet trod for us the fields of Galilee; not only must it live on, to endow each living soul with value and with dignity in the sight of his fellow-men, and of his own conscience, and of God; but more than that. It must enter in now—to-day—as a force, as a personal act of will, within every

poor, and depressed, and forlorn heart, to relieve its weakness, to heal its wounds, to renew its vigour. The Name of Jesus! That is what we want to have beneath us, as an energy, lodged within our innermost self—stirring where all was stagnant—a voice where all was dumb—a fire where all was frozen—a life where all was dead. We would be as the lame man whom Peter and John found laid in impotence at the beautiful gate—there, at the very entry into the glories—on the very threshold of peace, yet unable to go in, to reach, to enjoy! Year after year he lay at the door, and he got no further. Yet at last he heard a voice that spoke—"In the name of Jesus of Nazareth, rise and walk." And by that Name—through faith in that Name — his joints were strengthened. And he passed into the temple at whose gate he had lain in such long despair—"leaping, and singing, and praising God." "His Name, through faith in His Name." That is what St. Peter declared made this man whole in the presence of them all. "His Name, through faith in His Name." That is what is still declared to you on this day, the Feast of the Naming of Jesus! Thank God, the Name still lives!—is still at our disposal!—still can put out its ancient power.

It can do it in two ways, if we call upon it. First, it can meet the urgency of present distress by endowing us with the power to endure. Not all can be set right at once. The sins of society are old and deep; they will not be undone in a day. And our own inner growth of evil is a serious matter. It has long fibres and tangled roots. Not at once will they yield, even though the best social changes were carried out. No! And, therefore, for the long bad interval in which wrongs will linger unsubdued, the name of Jesus proves itself to us in patience, in consolation, in manly and quiet courage to endure. It shows itself in blessings to those that mourn, in comfort to those that suffer. It carries them through the dark hours that cannot yet break. It promises that, if they will believe it, blessed are the poor. This for the immediate hour.

But, secondly, it does not end in mere comfort. It enters, also, as the power of hope. Endurance for the moment, but hope for the future. Hope! because it proclaims the actual presence in our very midst of the force and the motive energy which, checked and choked though they be, are yet sufficient, if once loyally evoked, to bring about the New Day, when "they shall not burn or destroy in all the Holy Mountain." "And every man shall sit under his vine and his fig-tree, and sorrow and sighing shall all flee away." Hope! because this force—springing from His Name in whom all barriers are broken down between man and man, springing from Him who knows no distinction of person—is the one power that may yet avail to knit together into one body the divided brotherhood of man! Hope again! because this same force of the Name of Jesus can go down into the roots of the social mischief—can enter into the individual heart, and break up the hidden empire of sin, and can shatter the haughtiness of the proud; and can set the lame one upon his feet! My beloved, there is still hope for one and all! in this great church, in this huge London, in our ancient land of England! Let us hope on! That is our Gospel—the Gospel of Hope—even in the darkness of this New Year, as it opens upon us—doubtful and ominous—black with fog, cruel with cold. Ah! bitter, indeed, the blackness, anxious and stern the outlook. I know not how any preacher could have the heart to raise the banner of a sober and manly and serious hope this afternoon, if there were not this one prevailing and calming Name to which we may passionately cling—the Name which, in its sacred presence, will move with us into the coming year. Behind us as a pledge, before us as a presence, within us as a power. Let us, for one moment at least, before the toil and strife are on us again, cast aside dividing anger and suspicion, and unite, one and all, in an appeal of penitent prayer to that most merciful Name of Jesus—our Master, our Brother, our Redeemer!

THE RACE SET BEFORE US.

By the Rev. SINCLAIR CAROLIN, M.A.,
Rector of Wyvenhoe.

Sermon Preached in Wyvenhoe Parish Church, on Sunday Morning, November 13th, 1892.

"Know ye not that they which run in a race run all, but one receiveth the prize? So run, that ye may obtain."—1 Cor. ix. 24.

IN this chapter the Apostle finds it necessary to vindicate his claim to be an Apostle, against those Judaising teachers who maintained that, by his yielding up matters of private right for the sake of winning souls to Christ, he had betrayed his own consciousness that he was no true Apostle. He explains fully the reason of his renunciation of many Apostolic privileges by setting forth the real motive which actuated him—the true spirit of Christ's Gospel, "To the weak," he says, "became I as weak, that I might gain the weak. I am made all things to all men, that by all means I might win some."

Then follows my text, in which the Christian life, with its attendant self-renouncement, is set before us under the figure of a race, and in which the Apostle details how we should run, how he himself had run, exercising strong self-mastery, severe self-training, in his efforts to reach the goal of victory, the incorruptible crown of the righteousness of Christ.

The idea in the words I have read for our consideration this morning is taken from the four national festivals of the Greeks. At these, intellectual entertainments in the form of original literary productions, and athletic exhibitions were provided. The victor in the latter became the most enviable of Greek citizens until the next annual recurrence of the celebration; and though the prize was but a wreath of vine leaves—as the Apostle terms it, a corruptible crown—the hero of the day would not exchange his reward for the proudest diadem.

These periodical games were to the Greeks rather a passion than an amusement; and so St. Paul, in writing to his Grecian children, most frequently uses language drawn from the contests to describe and enforce the zeal and patience with which a Christian ought to strive after his heavenly reward. For example, in illustrating the struggle of the spirit with the flesh, he derives his imagery from the violent contest of the boxers: "So fight I, not as one that beateth the air." In like manner, to represent his perils at Ephesus, he draws a parallel from Roman gladiatorial sports, wherein man and beast barbarously struggled. But his usual reference is to the foot-race, as it was the most ancient and most esteemed of Grecian games. Patriotism now is so different from what it was to a Greek, whose whole State consisted of a single city, that we can only imagine, not realise, anything approaching the enthusiasm which mastered all other feelings in their hearts, to win this highest of human distinctions. The whole process of the struggle was eminently sensational; every movement was keenly criticised by the bystanders, some eulogising, others disparaging, until the goal is reached, when the victor becomes the focus of interest, and receives the most unqualified demonstrations of applause.

There is a lesson which these competitors—long since dead and laid to rest—can teach us. Let us view them at three places—(1) the starting-post; (2) during the race; and (3) at the goal.

A competitor's duty was first to place his name on the registry, as a guarantee that he was of genuine Greek birth. So must we, too, boldly enter ourselves on the list of God's labourers, not fearing the sneers of enemies, but convinced that herein our duty lies. They must needs be freeborn; the chaplet was never disgraced by the brow of a slave to be bought with a price. So it is not enough for us to be set free; we must be born again by the Holy Spirit into the glorious liberty of the children of God. The candidates were all naked—*i.e.*, they had cast off their outward flowing, cumbersome robes, and so proceeded to the race unimpeded; this was to their interest, and a necessity before they started. Even so must we "lay aside every weight, and the sin which doth so easily beset us, that we may run with patience the race that is set before us." All self-righteousness must be abandoned, all our secret as well as open sins, all our lesser as well as graver faults, must be cast away. We are too apt to forget that little foxes injure the grapes; that to our first parents the eating of the fruit of that one tree appeared trivial; that Saul thought light of sparing Agag and the best of the spoil of the Amalekites; but, my friends, such seemingly small and inconsiderable sins can be retained only at the expense of an immortal crown. And, oh! what shall it profit a man, if he gain the whole world, and lose his own soul?

Secondly, notice the competitors during the race: see their zeal, all are doing their best. The racecourse was short so that nothing might prevent great and steady exertion. And so our brief life is compared to the early dew on the grass, which disappears as the noon-day sun arises. Work while it is called to-day. The Grecian strugglers never looked behind, whether they stumbled or even fell their eyes were still fixed unflinchingly upon the wreath. Even so must we in our earthly course, our brief struggle heavenward, ever look to the reward, press on to the mark for the prize of the high calling of God in Christ Jesus, forgetting those things which are behind and reaching forth unto those things which are before, looking unto Jesus, the Author and Finisher of our faith.

And, thirdly, at the close of the race the heralds proclaimed aloud the name of the victor, his family, his tribe; the priceless crown was put upon him, and amidst the plaudits of the thronging multitude and the greetings of his friends, he forgot the many weary hardships, the many painful efforts, the sharp and bitter agony of the past. All was lost in the near joy of immediate triumph. And so, too, in the spiritual life, when the well-fought fight is over and the course finished, there remains for the faithful struggler a crown of righteousness which the Lord, the righteous Judge, shall give to him and to all who wait and long for His appearing.

> "These through fiery trials trod,
> These from great affliction came;
> Now before the throne of God,
> Sealed with his Almighty Name,
>
> "Clad in raiment pure and white,
> Victor-palms in every hand,
> Through their dear Redeemer's might,
> More than conquerors they stand."

So then if you would spur me on in the struggle after life, and blessedness, and glory, tell me not of the fleeting joys and the fading chaplets of earth, but point me rather to that far-off home, Jerusalem, the gold-paved city, the throne of God, the mansions of the blest, where with Moses and the prophets, with my Divine Master Christ, with St. Paul and all other earnest strugglers towards the mark, I may enjoy the happiness of heaven, prepared for those who have been faithful unto death.

My brethren, you and I are either competitors in this race of life, or else merely in the number of the spectators. If we are but amongst the latter, we shall before long hear the trumpet sound, and the announcement that the race is over, and the prize is lost to us for ever. Let us then hasten to enter the lists now, and wearing Christ's colours struggle onward and upward until we reach the gate of heaven itself where our Lord will with open arms receive us, and welcome us to the abodes of bliss, with the words, "Well done, thou good and faithful servant, enter thou into the joy of thy Lord."

THE Bishop of Ripon was prevented by illness from delivering his promised lecture on "Books" at the Borough-road Polytechnic on Thursday night.

WE understand that the subscriptions promised to the Cathedral memorial at Winchester to the late Bishop Harold Browne have at present reached £630; but £1,500 was the sum originally estimated by the committee as required for the altar-tomb and effigy.

SANITARY AND BURIAL REFORM.—Dr. W. B. Richardson presided last week at the monthly meeting of the Church of England Sanitary Association at the Church House. Mr. Fred. Scott, secretary of the Manchester Sanitary Association, read a paper upon "The Church the Great National Sanitary Agency." Dr. G. V. Poore, hon. secretary of the International Congress of Hygiene, read a paper upon "Earth-to-Earth Burial," in which he maintained that burial in the earth could be rendered harmless to the living. A discussion followed, in which Sir Spencer Wells, Bart., Mr. Morton, M.P., Canon Wilberforce, and others took part. At the Funeral Reform meeting which followed, resolutions were carried deprecating undue exposure at the grave-side, and urging upon cemetery authorities the duty of keeping the cemetery chapels properly heated. Next day the Home Secretary received a deputation from the Church of England Sanitary Association, and the Church of England Burial Reform Association, who were instructed to ask for, *inter alia*, the appointment of a Minister of Health, an exhaustive inquiry into the effect of earth-to-earth burial upon the subsoil, water, etc., and the more careful certification of the fact and cause of death in every case. The deputation, which was introduced by the Duke of Westminster, included the Bishop of Bedford, Sir Spencer Wells, Bart., Sir Henry Thompson, Sir Henry Roscoe, Sir G. Hunter, M.P., Gen. Lowry, the Archdeacon of London, Canon Scott-Holland, Rev. J. W. Hocking, Rev. R. B. Ransford, Rev. T. B. Paynter, Dr. G. V. Poore, Dr. Norman Kerr, Dr. Septimus Gibbon, Dr. W. Squire, Mr. Seymour Haden, Coroner Hicks, Mr. Smith Wright, M.P., Mr. G. R. Benson, M.P., Mr. Morton, M.P., Mr. Earle and others. Mr. Asquith, in reply, promised to communicate the views of the deputation respecting a Minister of Health to the Government, but could not encourage any hope of this part of the Memorial receiving a favourable response. He said that the demand for an enquiry into the modes of the disposal of the dead had been clearly made out, and he would consult with his colleague, the President of the Local Government Board, with a view to securing more careful registration of the fact and cause of death in every case.

NOTICES.

All communications respecting the Literary portion of the paper should be addressed to the Editor.

Business communications of every kind should be addressed to Mr. S. GIBBON, at the CHURCH OF ENGLAND PULPIT Office, 160, Fleet Street, London, E.C., to whom cheques and Post-office orders for subscriptions (in advance), three months, 2s., six months, 3s. 6d., twelve months, 6s. 6d., are to be made payable.

The Cases for binding Vol. XXXII. are now ready.

FOR HEALTH AND IMMORTALITY.

The Ecclesiastical Review.

SATURDAY, JANUARY 14, 1893.

THE HAT TRICK.

IN the case of "General" Booth and his social scheme we have always tempered justice with mercy. We have maintained that his plans might turn out useful if they had fair play, but they do not seem likely to get it—oddly enough—from "General" Booth himself.

There was originally a flavour of the confidence trick about "General" Booth's proposals; people objected from the first that there was no guarantee that the money raised should be ear-marked for charitable purposes. But those fears were set at rest by the execution of a deed which the general public was led to believe gave the required security. It was supposed that the funds were rendered inviolate, and that no changes in the administration of the Salvation Army could make any difference to the prospects of its "Social Wing."

After some time "General" Booth made a fresh appeal for funds; this we expected. First estimates are never correct, and it was distinctly unfair on the part of "General" Booth's critics to accuse him of bad faith on that score. So indeed it was to accuse him of bad faith at all. "General" Booth has been proved long ago to be a man of scrupulous honesty. In consequence, however, of attacks, a voluntary committee was formed by Lord Onslow to inquire into his proceedings—a distinctly friendly committee, which confessedly conducted its investigations in the most favourable manner possible.

In its report this committee gave one warning and offered one suggestion. While vindicating alike "General" Booth's honesty and business capacity, it criticised the spending of some of the

capital, subscribed for charity, on a Salvation Army barracks, and it suggested that the funds should be put in the hands of trustees. In other words, the committee, friendly as it was to "General" Booth, decided that there was no security that the money given for charitable objects could not be diverted from those objects, and that there was risk of it being diverted. For that is the only way to describe the building of the barracks, they have nothing whatever to do with the "Social Wing." It is true that the Army rents them from the "Social Wing," but there is no security that the rent will be paid; no trustees would have sanctioned the investment.

Well, "General" Booth has repudiated the committee's suggestion. He has loftily declared that he will have no masters, and he has appealed for £65,000 to be entrusted to him alone, employing, with questionable taste, the committee's vindication of his honesty as a testimonial to public credit.

This is simply the hat trick. The conjuror who wants to mystify his audience always does so by means of a committee who sit upon his stage. "General" Booth is doing the same with Lord Onslow's committee. He has pushed them into the front, and now he is busy sending the hat round. We are compelled to denounce such conduct. The very sensible demand for a guarantee, other than "General" Booth's personal assurance, has nothing offensive about it; it is satisfied by every philanthropic body in the kingdom, and it has been endorsed by a respectable and friendly committee of inquiry. By refusing to accede to it "General" Booth shows that he puts himself and his autocracy before the most important considerations of public welfare.

NOTES AND NEWS.

THERE has been premature rejoicing over the circumstance that Princess Marie's *trousseau* has been ordered almost entirely in London. The fact is that almost the whole of it will be manufactured by firms employing foreigners. If anything could add to the irritation of our workpeople at this absorption of British money in alien wages, it is the existence of such firms in London. We do not want the foreigner to execute the orders at all, but it is adding insult to injury when he comes and squats at our own fireside to do it.

WE cannot believe that there are no English firms capable of making the *trousseau*, even of an English princess. These things are affairs of fashion, and it is the fashion, unfortunately, of the house of Edinburgh, or at least some members of it, to be un-English. It is to be regretted, for English trade is not in a condition to be snubbed, and the English nation is not in a temper to allow it to be.

TIMES are bad, though perhaps not exceptionally bad. There has been a good deal of exaggeration about the unemployed, and the people least hurt have holloaed loudest. What is more remarkable than the number of the out-of-works is the number of men working short time, which is a very trustworthy index of the state of business. There is a vast amount of genuine and unavoidable distress, and we have still most of the winter before us. Charitably disposed persons will have no difficulty in easing their hearts and their purses; they had better be careful to give their alms in the right quarters. Begging is still a profitable business. Last week alone has furnished two cases of master mendicants who have been enabled by a bountiful public to amass house property and extensive investments. This is the sort of thing which makes the wise dispenser of charity tear his hair. He is at a loss for shillings, and he finds hundreds of pounds thrown away into the hands of impostors.

GREAT is the difference between being in and out of office. One of the freaks of the Radicals, during the last Administration, was tenderness to murderers. Provided his crime was sufficiently atrocious, a murderer was certain of a petition and a protest against his execution. Since we have had a Radical Home Secretary there has been an unusual crop of murders, some of singular atrocity (we do not imply a *post hoc, ergo propter hoc*, in this matter of murders). But not one of the criminals has been reprieved, and we have not observed any great outcry against Mr. Asquith. None the less, the leniency towards murderers, dictated, as it was, by the basest party motives, has had most distressing effects. The public is shocked by the most impious and blasphemous protestations of innocence from doubled-dyed scoundrels. Monsters like the sanctimonious ruffian McRae, for instance, who, having been convicted of a crime surpassing even the Whitechapel horrors in atrocity, has pressed all the most sacred emotions into his service in whines for mercy. It is very questionable whether utterances of this sort ought to be made public, they pollute and desecrate the highest and holiest sentiments. And they are to be attributed entirely to that mock-humanity manufactured by the least scrupulous portion of the press, which has endeavoured to intimidate ministers, and encourage murderers, with threats of popular resentment and hopes of popular sympathy.

AND the wretched criminals themselves have more cause of complaint than the public. Not only are they exposed to the additional agony of suspense, but they meet their doom unprepared and unrepentant. No Christian of whatever sect can quite calmly contemplate the fact that these guilty wretches are induced by false hopes to persevere in lies, to refrain from confession, and to refuse all opportunity of making their peace with Heaven. The precise value of a convicted murderer's repentance may be an unknown quantity; still it goes for what it is worth, and it is fearful to think that a squad of disreputable and interested journalistic hacks have been able, for a time, to add a new honour to guilt, instead of a new impediment.

MEANWHILE it is satisfactory to note that Mr. Asquith "out" and Mr. Asquith "in" are two very different people. After a while, may be, even the wildest Radical may find out that the administration of justice, the protection of the innocent and the punishment of the guilty, are not affairs of party politics.

Reviews and Notices.

"THE EXPOSITORY TIMES." Jan., 1893. Edinburgh: T. and T. Clark.

THERE is very much in this number that is very useful. We, however, enter a most emphatic dissent to Mr. Wright's remarks on Professor Marshall's able papers in the *Expositor*. To say that his suggestions "only need to be stated to be refuted" is simply absurd. The plain truth is that their force can only be appreciated by those who have some knowledge of Hebrew, and the number of those who have amongst the clergy is disgracefully few.

"THE EXPOSITOR." Jan., 1893. London: Hodder and Stoughton.

THE first number of the year has in it three very good papers. Perhaps the best of the three is Bishop Boyd Carpenter's on the "Parable of the Unjust Steward"—that amazingly difficult parable! To summarise—so far as that is possible—what the Bishop says, the parable is a warning against attempting to gain popularity by lowering the demands of religion. Thus the bishop's view is almost in direct opposition to that taken in *Pastor Pastorum*. But it has always seemed to us that the very curious view Dr. Latham took of the parable was the one defect in that very able book.

The second is Dr. Stalker on the "Children at Play," a very well written paper. We may however remark that this is only one of Christ's "Difficult Sayings," because the commentators have made it so. There *are* sayings of Christ's which really are difficult, but this, *read without the commentaries*, is clear enough.

And the third is the very interesting account of the "Gospel of Peter," and especially of Origen's use of it, by Mr. Murray.

There is also a very sympathetic account of Dr. Hort's labours, especially in the textual criticism of the New Testament. Professor Bruce is very disappointing; we hoped for something after the manner of Dr. Matheson's "Spiritual Development of St. Paul," and instead we have the old foolish German theories refuted yet again. And Archdeacon Farrar's "Gush and Vulgarity" is a disgrace to the pages of the *Expositor*.

THE Bishop of Rochester and Mrs. Davidson, who had been visiting Lord Selborne and also the Bishop of Winchester, left Farnham Castle on Saturday.

WE are glad to learn from the *Yorkshire Post* that the Bishop of Wakefield was allowed by his medical adviser to drive to Heckmondwike and Liversedge on Sunday, in order to fulfil his engagements to preach in these parishes, but his lordship had to sit during the delivery of the sermons.

THE *Yorkshire Post* says that the Bishop of Durham, who is taking a very keen interest in the proper housing of the miners, made a visit of inspection the other day. He was accompanied by the vicar of Auckland and one of the parish curates, and paid a visit to Pease's-rows, at Southchurch, which are anything but "model" houses. His lordship went into a good many of the houses, and even ascended into some of the garrets.

CORRESPONDENCE.

To the Editor of the CHURCH OF ENGLAND PULPIT AND ECCLESIASTICAL REVIEW.

THE TEMPTATION IN EDEN.

SIR,—"F. T. P." in his letter to the PULPIT of the 24th ult., says that he cannot understand Gen. iii. to be historical if we "eliminate the serpent." Of course it is the animal serpent he means; because it was only he that I tried to "eliminate" in my paper. It is so much the worse for himself if he cannot thus understand it; but, in reply, may I ask him if he would consider it historical by not "eliminating the serpent"? If so, then he is bound to accept, as an historical truth, that the animal actually spake and reasoned, as the serpent is recorded to have done. But I rather fancy that he will reply negatively, by saying, that the term "serpent" is only used there "figuratively" or "symbolically." Be it so; but then I reply that it must be a figure or symbol of some real being, and who that being was is the point in dispute. When we find in other parts of Scripture the terms "Serpent," "the devil," and "Satan," used as interchangeable, we have no choice in the matter. If it were true that the Hebrews borrowed this story from the Persian theology, it would follow that the serpent would represent Angromainyush, and so, on this ground of his own, "F. T. P." cannot refuse to believe in the real presence of the wicked spirit as the tempter of Eve; because he believes in the Parsis being inspired, and divine inspiration would not teach mythology. He seems to confound a mythical with a figurative being. They are not the same. A figurative being has a real existence; a mythical being has no existence at all, except in the imagination, and could be a figure of nobody. Things, to be symbols, must be symbols of somethlng real; and a name used "allegorically" must be so used in reference to a real personage. St. Paul says, in speaking of the two sons of Abraham, "the one by a bondmaid, the other by a free woman; that these things are an allegory, representing the two covenants; Hagar is Mount Sinai." And thus, whether we regard the name serpent as figurative, symbolical, or allegorical, we come to the same conclusion, that a real being was intended by it. "F. T. P." calls this individual Angromainyush, I prefer the Scriptural name of Satan or the devil; but as we agree in reference to his concrete personal existence, we shall not quarrel about his name.

But I prefer to regard "the serpent" not as a figurative or allegorical term, but one as literal as "the devil." And though a term might be used allegorically in a narrative, that would not make all the actions of that individual allegorical. If we suppose the serpent in Gen. iii. to be an allegorical personage, his actions will be mixed up with those of two historical ones, and thus part of the narrative will be historical and part allegorical; a mode of interpretation which was given up long ago as unphilosophical and uncritical, by the ablest critics against the divinity of the story. Moses, in Gen. iii., is telling us what took place in Eden long before his time; but allegories are not used to explain the past, but rather as guides for the future; and to be such they must be grounded on usages that are *well known*, and upon facts and circumstances easily understood. Take, for instance, Jotham's allegory or parable of the trees electing for

themselves a king; if there never had been such a thing in the world as a people electing a king over themselves, his allegory would have been ridiculous, it would have utterly failed in teaching power. So if Moses did not wish to point out some real tempter by the serpent in Gen. iii., his allegory, if it be one, has no meaning whatever. But still I am met with the reply, that this was the form in which Moses chose to point out an "underlying idea." But an "underlying idea" of what? *Of a real tempter?* Of this and nothing else? Precisely so. But the idea does not "underlie" at all, it arises out of the facts of the narrative, which, even on this footing, cannot be regarded otherwise than as historical. That it is history and nothing else I will prove from other parts of Scripture.

St. Paul says, "By one man sin entered into the world." Here is a plain historical fact. He also says that "the woman being deceived was in the transgression," which is another historical fact. He says again, "Lest by any means as the serpent beguiled Eve." This is a third historical fact. What more do we want to make the story historical? "The serpent beguiled Eve." St. Paul is not here speaking figurately, nor in allegory, nor by way of pictorial representation, but of a plain, though sad matter of fact. But who was the "beguiler"—the animal or Satan? It could not be the animal; it must, therefore, have been Satan. Perhaps "F. T. P." would prefer to call him Angromainyush? Some people have a difficulty in thinking of the devil speaking, and consider that this is another piece of "pictorial representation," or allegory. For my part, I see no more difficulty in this than in his asking Christ to worship him; nor in "filling the hearts of Ananias and Sapphira with a lie"; nor in "working in the children of disobedience;" nor in "blinding the eyes of them that believe not." Why should not the Devil be able to talk to men, as well as Gabriel did to Zacharias and Daniel. And if the expression be figurative, as some contend, I ask, what is it a figure of? If Satan have not a means of reaching the minds of people, it is simply a figure of nothing. But how can it be said that, when a spiritual being holds intercourse with a human soul, the terms describing that intercourse are figurative? See the case of Gabriel, quoted above. When some people do not understand the spirituality of the *modus operandi* of certain things in Scripture, they fall back upon this very convenient mode of interpretation by calling them figures of speech. Throughout all his epistles on this subject "F. T. P." has confounded the figurative with the mythical. He says that the garden, the tree, the serpent, are figurative, and then he appears to conclude that they had no real existence, that there was neither tree, nor garden, nor serpent in the whole transaction. This would make the story fabulous and legendary. If these terms be figurative or symbolical, as "F. T. P." contends, then the things thus denominated must have had real existence; because otherwise they could have been neither figures nor symbols. In figurative language there are always two objects expressed or understood; the one *from* which the term is taken, and the other *to* which it is applied; so that if the term serpent be figurative, it is taken from the animal and applied to the devil; and the same remark is applicable to "Upon thy belly shalt thou go." Granted that this is figurative language, then it of necessity implies that there was a real being to whom the words were applicable. The narrative records that God *actually* spake these words; and I could not in my conscience believe that He uttered this grave and dignified discourse, and at the same time spoke to nobody, or to a senseless animal. His own inspiration would not represent Him as acting in this way. Now, the Almighty was a real personage in the matter; so was Adam, and so was Eve; and we have found above that even if we regard the "serpent" as a figurative term, there was the presence of a real spiritual tempter; and so also with the garden, and the tree, and the talking. May I ask again, what more is required to make history, when all the personages were real, and the actions performed by them natural and real? I pity that form of intelligence that cannot see in the declarations of the Bible a testimony to the personal existence of Satan; and a similar feeling pervades my mind towards any one that would, on the same ground, exclude him from the scene in the garden; and if we bear in mind that he tempts now as then, that is, by tellig lies—"he was a liar from the beginning"—we will have no difficulty in perceiving that he needed not the help of the animal in his wicked work. Perhaps it would be well to draw attention a little further to the way in which figurative terms are used in the Bible. James and John were called by the figurative name of "Sons of Thunder" but this did not deprive them of a real existence, nor make all their actions allegorical. So also with regard to our Lord. Many are the figurative terms applied to Him. He is called a sun, a star, a branch, all of which are intended to point out different features in His character.

I hope I have made my meaning clear. Granted, what my opponents claim, that the term serpent is figurative, yet for the reasons given above I hold him to have been a real personage, and that the record in Gen. iii. is an historical narration of what he said and did on that memorable occasion; and as the term is allowed on both sides to be figurative, the personage could not have been the animal, because it is *from* him the term is taken in order to be applied *to* another. There was then no personage "to spirit away" in that record. I cannot compliment "F. T. P." on the use of such a phrase towards Holy Scripture.

January 7th, 1893. R. DONALDSON.

THE KINGDOM OF GOD AND OF HEAVEN.

SIR,—I regret that, having mislaid it, I cannot lay my hands, in time for the writing of this letter, on the PULPIT of December 17th, which contained "Student's" first letter on the above-mentioned subject, so that I cannot refer to it for the "reason" that, it appears, he indicated there, "for thinking that the 'kingdom of God' does not mean the same as 'the kingdom of heaven.'" I am under the impression that he has rather taken for granted that they were not the same; at any rate, I cannot remember any reason that he gave for supposing they were different. But even supposing there were a difference between the two kingdoms, I cannot perceive or remember any reason that he has given for supposing that "the kingdom of God" means "the communion of saints," and "the kingdom of heaven" "the Catholic Church."

But I notice what he urges in his last from the difference between the second, third, fourth, and seventh of the seven parables of Matthew xiii., on the one hand, and the first, and, I suppose, the fifth and sixth also, on the other. Of course, all these parables differ

one from the other in their teaching: there is no tautology in their meaning. But I submit that they all illustrate various aspects and stages of the same kingdom. The fifth and sixth, which are so mysteriously put in a different category by "Student," are expressly called by our Lord parables of "the kingdom of heaven," just like the other four which "Student" distinguishes so strangely from them and from the first. As to the first, though it is not prefaced, like all the rest of the series, with the words "The kingdom of heaven is like," yet our Lord, in verse 11, when asked by His disciples about this very parable, why He spake unto the people in parables, "answered and said unto them, Unto you it is given to know the mysteries of *kingdom of heaven*." So that plainly the first of the seven, like the fifth, the sixth, and the other four, was and is a parable of "the kingdom of heaven." "Student" says that the four parables which he differentiates from the other three "illustrate an outward kingdom, the subjects of the kingdom being various in their degrees of loyalty." I say that all the seven parables, one as much as another, illustrate the kingdom of heaven or of God as being, what it is now, both an inward and an outward kingdom. He says, "The first parable, that of the Sower, is applicable to the reign of God over the hearts of the saints, having plainly that reference." Certainly one, the fourth, of the four grounds on which the Sower, who is the Son of Man, scatters His good seed, may be said to refer to "the hearts of the saints"; but just as certainly the other three grounds refer to the failure of the good seed to produce any real "reign of God over the hearts" of those who have received the good seed, or to make "saints" of them. "Student's" reference to those seven parables, with a view to helping out his distinction between the "kingdom of God" as meaning the "Communion of Saints," and "the kingdom of heaven" as meaning "the Catholic Church," is really fatal to his distinction. They *all* refer to "the kingdom of heaven" according to our Lord's words in Matt. xiii. 11, and to "the kingdom of God" according to His words in Mark iv. 11, and Luke viii. 10. The third, that of the mustard-seed, is expressly called by our Lord an illustration of "the kingdom of heaven," in Matt. xiii. 31, and an illustration of "the kingdom of God" in Mark iv. 30, 31. The fifth and sixth, which, as well as the first, he distinguishes from the rest, as if they were parables of "the kingdom of God," and not of "the kingdom of heaven," are expressly said by our Lord, in Matt. xiii. 5, 6, to illustrate "the kingdom of heaven." If I wanted an argument for the identity of the two kingdoms, I could hardly find a better than can be drawn from the facts about these parables as they occur in the Synoptic Gospels. Indeed, I have already so used one of those facts, viz., the same mysteries of the same kingdom being called by our Lord in Matt. xiii. 11, "the mysteries of the kingdom of heaven," and in Mark iv. 11, and Luke viii. 10, "the mysteries," or "the mystery of the kingdom of God." This is, to my mind, and I think to the minds of reasonable men in general, proof positive that the two kingdoms are identical.

And yet "Student" says, I "advance no reason for my view of the matter." Is there no reason for my view of the matter in what I have advanced above, or in the similar fact which I drew "Student's" attention to on Dec. 17th, that the subject of the preaching which our Lord gave the twelve on one occasion and in the same words is called by St. Matthew (x. 7), "the kingdom of heaven" and by St. Luke (ix. 2), "the kingdom of God"? Is it possible, I ask again, that these two Evangelists understood the commission differently—one that the twelve were to preach "the Catholic Church," and the other that they were to preach "the Communion of Saints"? And yet this is what I understand is "Student's" view of the matter.

St. Matthew says (iv. 17), "From that time Jesus began to preach, and to say, Repent, for the kingdom of heaven is at hand." The parallel place in St. Mark's Gospel is, "Jesus came into Galilee preaching the Gospel of the kingdom of God, and saying, The time is fulfilled, and the kingdom of God is at hand: repent ye and believe the Gospel." Did our Lord, according to these two accounts, preach two different kingdoms as being at hand—one "the Catholic Church," the other "the Communion of Saints"? Or when He said in Matt. xix. 14 about the infants that were brought to Him, "Of such is the kingdom of heaven," or, as in Mark x. 14 and Luke xviii. 16, "Of such is the kingdom of God"—did He speak with such a double meaning as that one Evangelist understood Him to mean, "Of such is the Catholic Church," and the other two, "Of such is the Communion of Saints"?

That the kingdom which the Jews expected and inquired after, and which they were told was "at hand" and was "among them," was the kingdom which the *God of heaven* was to set up (Dan. ii. 44), fully accounts for its being called indifferently "the kingdom of God" and "the kingdom of heaven," or, as it was to be reigned over by the Christ the Son of God, "the kingdom of Christ" or "the kingdom of God's dear Son."

"Student" seems to think that unless we take his view of this matter, we must hold that there is no difference between "the Catholic Church" and "the Communion of Saints," as those two Articles occur in the Apostles' Creed. I need hardly say that that does not by any means follow. I might say that the kingdom of God or heaven means neither "the Catholic Church" nor "the Communion of Saints." If "the Catholic Church" means "all who profess and call themselves Christians," than "the kingdom" and "the Catholic Church" are pretty closely identified. If, as I prefer to say—and as many eminent authorities have said—it means all true Christians, then I consider it is not identical with the kingdom as it is now, for the kingdom evidently includes tares as well as wheat, bad fish as well as good, things and persons that will be gathered out of it at the end of the age.

As to "the Communion of Saints," I believe it to mean the blessed fact that all saints, or Christians indeed, have fellowship or communion in certain blessings, privileges, or relationships which they all share in common. For instance (see Eph. iv. 4, 5, 6), they are all members of the "one body," indwelt by the "one Spirit," have all "one hope of their calling, one Lord, one faith, one baptism, one God and Father of all." I need not go outside these seven "ones" for what constitutes a very splendid "Communion of Saints." Communion and fellowship are the English synonyms of the Greek word κοινωνία, which in New Testament language always, I think, means what is shared, or partaken of in common by many or by few, whether it be the communion (or fellowship) of the Holy Ghost, the communion (or fellowship) of the Body and Blood of Christ, or the Communion (or fellowship) of Saints.

I do not see how the "Communion of Saints" can

be rightly identified with either "the Catholic Church," or "the kingdom of God or of heaven," or "the kingdom of God's dear Son."

Jan. 9th, 1893. W. T. HOBSON.

UNLIMITED DISCRETION.

SIR,—The Lincoln judgment may be deemed past and done with, but I fancy we have not heard the last of this *compromise*, as we are told to regard it. Can such an attempt to patch up matters lead to any good hope of better agreement? This must depend on good sense and feeling. This ruling, to which agreement and submission is advised by some in authority as our leaders, I cannot help regarding as both insulting and dishonest. A large body of clergy and laity have gone on in advanced ceremonial and practices, preaching, writing, teaching that their views and ways were only the outer garment of what they held more or less as essential truth. These fellow-Churchmen, I think, have been insulted while allowed all they wanted up to the present. Our Church in England and the Colonies is told that all the practices in question mean nothing! I hope that all who side with a man deservedly esteemed like the Bishop of Lincoln can overlook the insult to views and ways conscientiously held, and will not go further! This ruling may be termed dishonest. The late Bishop of Lincoln was no mean authority in ecclesiastical lore. Christopher Wordsworth—let me use his honoured name—gave his opinion unmistakably as to the "mixed cup" in opposition to the present Dean of York. That learned, devout, and staunch bishop of our Church has been taken away for his happiness and to our loss; others, too, God's noblemen, Archbishops Tait and Magee, are gone. Were those splendid prelates still in the land, a good many of the clergy and laity would thank God for their wisdom and honesty, and hope to see daylight nearer to us. If any of your clerical readers, sir, want to know why I dare to call the mixing in the sacramental cup, with or without discretion according to individual feeling, a *dishonest* judgment, I reply, Read its terms for yourselves. Mix, if you like, only do it in the vestry. A friend of mine said, "But the good sense and good feeling of the English clergy would regulate the matter." I have a high opinion of my friend's good sense and good feeling; but supposing he is about to officiate in conjunction with the incumbent, and the rector or vicar has his own ideas about what the "mixed cup" means, my friend would either remain behind in the vestry or do his part with very ruffled feelings. How are laymen likely to feel on going into a strange church where they know they are at the mercy of some incumbent or curate in whose good sense they have no confidence? But why should there be utter confusion to please the few? A bishop lately told his clergy that those clergy who did not like the late Privy Council decree "had better go. Some had left the Church, and those who were not satisfied had better go." This is not advice which many of the clergy are likely to take. We value our Church, and are not going to be driven out of it by any such advice.

This insulting and dishonest judgment may hasten disestablishment; if so, we shall see how laymen will act. I hope I may not be set down as opposed to all comprehension and latitude. In such a National Church as the Church of England, there should be some latitude allowed to a large body of earnest men whom we respect for their zeal, though a larger and important body of clergy and laity cannot agree with them.

The Bishop of London has come out well in requesting his clergy to consult and be guided by their bishop. If such advice is given by all the Bench of Bishops, this exceedingly curious judgment may not bring forth the mischief which it threatens. At present we only know that a few of our leaders advise a hearty reception of the judgment, but no word of warning or paternal advice have I seen to the effect that, "offences must come, but woe to those by whom they come." If it may be allowed to divine "the good sense and good feeling" which my anonymous friend relies on, I would interpret my ideas of men opposed to novelties thus: Let this judgment go for what it is worth, but may heaven help us as to the good sense and good feeling of some men as to "mixed chalice." Of all places where we desire "Peace on Earth" it is in the services of our Church, and of all services where we desire peace it is in the Holy Communion, with feelings undisturbed by novelties upsetting the manners and customs of our National Church for 300 years.

Dec. 30th, 1892. LOOKER-ON.

P.S.—On not leaving time-honoured worship, see Bishop Heber's Sermons, vol. i., 6th ed., 1848, p. 119. The exhortation of Bishop Heber is not—if you do not like the Temple, leave it.

THE Rev. W. A. Morris, vicar of St. Anne's, Lambeth, has been ordered to take a prolonged rest, owing to ill-health.

THE Bishop of Carlisle and family have left Rose Castle for the south of the diocese, and for the next three months their address will be Thornleigh, Grange-over-Sands, *via* Carnforth.

THE Rev. G. W. Woodhouse, vicar of Albrighton, near Shifnal, Salop, has just entered on his ninety-fourth year. He was ordained in 1824, and was presented to the living of Albrighton in 1836.

THE Norrisian Professorship at Cambridge has been vacated by the promotion of Professor Lumby. It is said that Mr. Armitage Robinson, of Christ's, and Mr. F. Wallis, of Caius, will be candidates for the post.

AFTER his thirty years' continuous work at St. Alban's, Holborn, the Rev. A. H. Stanton is going to take a whole year's holiday. In a letter to the *Church Times* he announces that during his absence from England his letters about St. Alban's should be addressed to the Rev. G. R. Hogg, and those referring to St. Martin's League to Mr. Walter Shroder, Hampstead, N.W. Letters addressed to himself will remain unopened until his return.

THE Rev. Reginald Currey has placed himself at the Bishop of Southwell's disposal to take the place of parish clergy during either vacancies or illness. The payments for his services will be at the usual rates, as is the practice with St. Andrew's Society, in the diocese of Salisbury. Mr. Currey will receive the payments and pay them into the bank towards his stipend, for which the Bishop is responsible, and to which the council have promised a contribution. The Bishop will be glad to receive subscriptions for this new diocesan office, the need of which has been for some time urgently pressed upon him.

PREFERMENTS AND APPOINTMENTS.

Beaumont, Rev. Francis Morton, M.A., Vicar of Holy Trinity, Coventry, and Rural Dean ; Honorary Canon of Worcester Cathedral.
Carter, Rev. J. G., M.A. ; Rector of Hale, near Salisbury.
Cocks, Rev. Arthur Reginald Carew, M.A. ; to St. Mary's Hospital, Great Ilford.
Cooke, Rev. Edward A., Vicar of Attleborough, Nuneaton ; Vicar of Reddal Hill, near Cradley Heath, Staffordshire.
Cornish, Rev. Charles E., M.A., Vicar of St. Mary's, Redcliffe, and Honorary Canon of Bristol ; Rural Dean of Bristol.
Currey, Rev. Reginald H. S., M.A. ; Diocesan Special Service Clergyman for the Diocese of Southwell.
De Laney, Rev. William Charles, M.A. ; Licensed to Officiate in the Diocese of Liverpool.
Dodd, Rev. James, Senior Curate of St. Mary's, Rawtenstall ; Curate-in-Charge of the New Church of St. Peter's, Laneside, Haslingden.
Doveton, Rev. W. Blake, Vicar of Corston ; Rural Dean of Keynsham.
Duckett, Rev. T., B.A. ; Vicar of Nunkeeling, Hull.
Foster, Rev. Herbert Henry, M.A. ; General Preacher in the Diocese of Lincoln.
Harrison, Rev. Albert R., M.A., Vicar of St. Chad's, Stafford ; Vicar of Tettenhall, Wolverhampton.
Harrison, Rev. Daniel, M.A. ; Vicar of Setmurthy, Cockermouth.
Henning, Rev. C. ; Vicar of Sidlesham, Sussex.
Hipwell, Rev. J., M.A., late Vicar of Leavenheath ; Rector of Elmswell, Suffolk.
Hughes, Rev. Thomas, D.D. ; Rector of Mongewell, Oxon.
Hunter, Rev. Henry Rudd, Rector of Kirton, Notts ; Rector of Wath, near Ripon.
Jenkins, Rev. John, Curate of St. Lawrence's, York ; Rector of All Saints', Easington, with St. Michael's, Liverton, Yorkshire.
Johnson, Rev. George Herbert, M.A. ; Vicar of West Hanney, Berks.
Kilner, Rev. F. C., M.A., Vicar of Bingley ; Surrogate for the Diocese of Ripon.
Leigh-Lye, Rev. Arthur, B.A., Vicar of St. Matthew's, Rugby ; Surrogate for the Diocese of Worcester.
Parr, Rev. Edward Robinson, M.A., Chaplain of Holy Trinity Church, Boulogne ; Vicar of Chertsey, Surrey.
Powell, Rev. William, M.A., Vicar of St. Crispin's, Bermondsey ; Vicar of Hayton. Cumberland.
Purchas, Rev. G. T. W., Curate of Great Driffield ; Vicar of Watton-with-Beswick, East Yorkshire.
Wallace, Rev. Joseph, M.A., Vicar of Hayton, Cumberland ; Vicar of St. Crispin's, Bermondsey.

CLERICAL OBITUARY.

Belcombe, Rev. Francis Edward, of the Brooms, Staffordshire, at 9, Victoria-square, Clifton, Bristol, on the 7th inst., aged 65.
Bindley, Rev. F. W., M.A., Rector of Gosforth, at Newcastle-on-Tyne, on the 22nd ult., aged 61.
Broughton, Rev. Henry Vivian, late Vicar of St. Mary's, Leicester, and Honorary Canon of Peterborough Cathedral, at Rothsay-road, Bedford, on the 6th inst.
Eagar, Rev. Canon, M.A., Rector of Ashton-under-Lyne, at the Rectory, Ashton-under-Lyne, on the 2nd inst., aged 78.
Hey, Rev. Samuel, M.A., Rector of Sawley since 1844, and Rural Dean from 1852 to 1880, at Sawley Rectory, Derbyshire, on the 3rd inst., in his 88th year.
Hillyard, Rev. George, at 3, Gainsborough-gardens, Hampstead, on the 6th inst., aged 80.
McNeile, Rev. Edmund Hugh, Vicar of St. Paul's, Princes Park, Liverpool, and Honorary Canon of Liverpool, at St. Paul's Vicarage, on the 8th inst., aged 52.
Wells, Rev. Henry, B.A., Vicar of St. Bartholomew's, Camberwell, at Bournemouth, on the 31st ult., aged 42.
Wood, Rev. William Bryan, Curate of Westham, on the 4th ult., aged 46.
Wyvill, Rev. Christopher Edward, for twenty-two years Rector of the parish, at Spennithorne Rectory, Yorkshire, on the 5th inst., aged 72.

FIRST REMOVE THE CAUSE.

MEN frequently worry and trouble themselves a great deal in trying to cure the symptoms of vital weakness, nervous exhaustion, and kindred ailments, instead of endeavouring to first remove the cause. This can be done by Mr. Harness' Electropathic Treatment without the aid of drugs. It is useless to tell sufferers to employ their minds and bodies in useful work and to forget their disorders, so long as the cause of their troubles is not removed. How can it be expected that when they are fatigued by the least exertion they can occupy themselves by studying, walking, or other exercise? Even in conversation they frequently lose the thread of it and repeatedly find their memory failing them. What can they do? Physic will not cure them—perhaps the leading physicians have fallen to afford them any relief, and they have consequently become hopeless. It is to such as these that Mr. Harness' new combined Electropathic Belt and Suspensory is so strongly recommended, as, by its gentle but continuous action, invigorating electric currents are imperceptibly generated and conveyed direct from the spinal cord to the affected parts. It is this scientifically constructed and convenient appliance which silently but surely acts upon the vital organs, and removes the cause of the patient's disease, effecting a wonderful change in his health, character, and conduct, and speedily enabling him to return to his natural tastes and habits, and enjoy once more the full vigour of youth, with all its accompanying pleasures.

We may add that this perfect Electro-medical appliance is exceedingly comfortable to wear, gives wonderful support and vitality to all the internal organs of the body, prevents chills, imparts new life and vigour to the debilitated constitution, stimulates the organic action, promotes the circulation, assists digestion, and promptly renews that vital energy, the loss of which is the first symptom of decay. Its healing properties are multifarious. It stimulates the functions of various organs, increases their secretions, gives tone to muscle and nerves, relaxes morbid contractions, improves nutrition, and effectually renews exhausted nerve force. Acting directly on the system, it sustains and assists its various functions, and thus promotes the health and vigour of the entire frame. Besides these benefits, the mind is maintained in a buoyant, cheerful state, and every faculty is stimulated to the highest condition of intellectual strength.

Gentlemen who read the above announcement have only to visit London and call at the Electropathic and Zander Institute (52, Oxford Street, W.) to be convinced of the marvellous curative powers of Electricity and Mr. Harness' perfect methods of imperceptibly applying the current. The medical officers of the establishment are in daily attendance, and may by consulted free of charge either personally or by letter.

The Church of England Pulpit.

UNTIL HIS COMING AGAIN.

By the Rev. W. T. HOBSON, M.A., Vicar of St. Barnabas, Douglas.

Sermon Preached in St. Barnabas' Church, on Sunday, December 4th, 1892.

"For as often as ye eat this bread, and drink this cup, ye do show the Lord's death till He come."—1 Cor. xi. 26.

ST. PAUL had, in the three verses that immediately precede these words, declared to the Corinthians how he had received of the Lord Himself the account of His institution of the Lord's Supper. As he says elsewhere of the Gospel itself, in his Epistle to the Galatians, that he "neither received it of man nor was he taught it but by the revelation of Jesus Christ." So he says here to the Corinthians of this great Gospel ordinance, "I have received of the Lord that which also I delivered unto you. That the Lord Jesus the same night in which He was betrayed took bread, and when He had given thanks, He brake it and said, Take, eat, this is My body which is given for you; this do in remembrance of Me. After the same manner also He took the cup when He had supped. saying, This cup is the new covenant in My blood; this do ye, as oft as ye drink it in remembrance of Me." And then comes our text, which is not of course part of the Lord's words of institution, but is the inspired Apostle's words of further instruction concerning the ordinance: "For as often as ye eat this bread, and drink this cup, ye do show the Lord's death till He come."

"Till He come!" "Occupy till I come" are the words our Lord puts in the mouth of the nobleman, in His parable, who went away to the far country to receive for himself a kingdom and to return; the nobleman, who represents Himself, Who is gone back to the Father to receive for Himself the kingdom over this world that rejected Him, and that still rejects Him, and to return,—to return and reign, in spite of a rejecting world. Those words are addressed to the servants of the absent King, and they bid them be diligent in serving Him, in working for Him, in fulfilling all good works prepared for them to walk in, in using for their Master's profit and to His glory the pounds, the talents, He has entrusted to them.

These other words "till He come" in our text refer not so much to work as to worship, not to the continual serving of our absent Master in righteousness and true holiness in the work and labour of love, to be maintained unceasingly by His disciples; but more particularly to this one great ordinance of Christian worship and service, to be also maintained unceasingly in His Church "until His coming again."

There is a sect of professing Christians which has been in existence for now over 200 years, and which, strangely enough, has numbered some excellent people in its ranks, which has managed to persuade itself that neither Baptism nor the Lord's Supper ought to be observed as outward rites. They admit that they were observed as such by some New Testament Christians at any rate and under sanction of Christ's Apostles, but this they attribute to human frailty and the remains of Jewish formalism. When pondering my text, I became curious to know what the Quakers—for it is of them I speak—would say about it, or how they would get over its plain intimation that Christ's inspired Apostle considered and taught that the celebration of the Lord's Supper was to go on "until His coming again." I turned to a book in my book-shelves, entitled "An Apology for the true Christian Divinity, as the same is held forth and preached by the people called, in scorn, the Quakers," by Robert Barclay; and this is what Barclay, the theologian of that sect, says on the point: "Whereas they," *i.e.*, all other Christians from the beginning, then, and ever since, "urge the words, 'Ye show the Lord's death till He come'; insinuating that this imports a necessary continuance of that ceremony, until Christ come, at the end of the world, to judgment. I answer, They take here for granted without proof . . . that this coming is understood of Christ's last outward coming, and not of His inward and spiritual . . . that remains to be proved; whereas the Apostle might well understand it of His inward coming and appearance, which, perhaps, some of those carnal Corinthians that used to come drunken together had not known; and others being weak among them, and inclinable to dote upon outwards, this might have been indulged to them for a season, and even used by those who knew Christ's appearance in spirit (as other things were of which we shall speak hereafter) especially by the Apostle, who became weak to the weak and all to all that he might save some." You see he thinks that to partake of the Lord's Supper, and to show forth the Lord's death in that outward rite, was suitable enough—and that in the estimation of St. Paul—for carnal Christians and for such as used to come drunken to that ordinance, but was unsuitable for spiritual Christians, and was to cease when the inward light of true spiritual Christianity arose in their hearts! How wonderful are the devices of Satan for inducing Christians to disobey and dishonour Christ! How varied they are to suit the varied frailty of

men and women! You know how with some of you, my brethren, he keeps you from showing forth the Lord's death as He commanded, by suggesting to your hearts that you are too carnal, not spiritual enough, not sufficiently grown in grace—not good enough, in fact, to eat that bread and to drink that cup with your fellow-Christians; and so he gets *you* to disobey your Lord. But you see how he takes the very opposite line with the Quakers, and suggests to them that only the carnal, only the babes in Christ, not spiritually-minded people like them—I suppose there are no babes in Christ among them—should eat that bread and drink that cup. But observe how, to suit his purpose, he spiritualises away—spiritualises out of his way—the plain allusion of our text to the second coming of Christ, in power and great glory. as if there were room for a doubt or a question, that it is to that St. Paul alludes in our text. And I would remark that he uses for his purpose—and, alas! it suits his purpose only too well — that passage of St. Peter's second Epistle which we read in the second lesson this morning, where, by what I believe to be a deplorable mispunctuation, he is made to speak of the day dawning and the day star arising in our hearts, instead of bidding us take heed in our hearts to the sure word of prophecy as unto a light shining in a dark place until the day dawn and the day star arise,* *i.e.*, until that coming and kingdom of our Lord Jesus Christ, of which he had been speaking, as shown forth in the Transfiguration vision of which he and James and John were eye-witnesses. What accession of inward light was he leading his brethren to expect —who, he says, had "obtained like precious faith with himself"—that could be called the day dawning and the day star arising in their hearts?

My brethren, it is "till He come" in power and great glory; it is till the day indeed dawn upon this night which is far spent, the day which is at hand for us all; it is till the day star, aye, the Sun of Righteousness Himself arises upon the world with much-needed healing in His wings; it is till then that the Lord's death is to be shown forth by His Church, in the eating of that bread and the drinking of that cup; that bread which represents His body, given for us in sacrificial death for our sins, and that cup which represents His blood, the blood of the new covenant, shed for the remission of our sins. From year to year, from century to century, if the "little while between" were to be lengthened out so long, there was to be this continual showing forth, proclaiming—as it is more properly in the Revised Version—proclaiming that great fact, the Lord's death, in all its significance, in all its meaning of atonement, all its everlasting testimony to the awful righteousness of our sin-hating, sin-punishing God, and to the exceeding great grace and love of our sinner-loving, sinner-forgiving God. It was to go on in all its hallowed meaning and purpose of communion and fellowship between us and our gracious God and Father, to whom we are reconciled by the death of His Son; and between us each and all as His children, one in Christ Jesus, fellow-members of the same body, and so feasting in fellowship one with another, round the same holy table, on the same holy food, the spiritual food of the precious body and blood of our one Saviour Christ, the one sacrifice for our sins.

This ordinance thus reaches across all the time of this dispensation, from the time of our Lord's going away to the time of His coming again, all the time of His absence in the far country. It is done as commanded in memory of the absent Jesus. It is done as commanded in hope and expectation of the returning Jesus. It thus unites in one faith, and one hope, and one love all the saints of God in every place and in all time. What we are about to do here, our fellow-Christians in India, in China, in the far west and in the far east, in north and south, in the other islands of the sea are doing continually, many of them at the same moment of time. What we are about to do now our fellow-Christians have been doing in all past generations of the Church, and, doubtless, will do in all future generations of the Church, if the Lord delays His coming so long.

Very varied have been the circumstances—of darkness and light, of superstition and knowledge, of rest and persecution, of comparative deadness and of revived spirituality. In splendid cathedral or in plain upper room, or secret glen amid the sheltering mountains, by the bedside of the sick and dying, whether in gilded palace or in meanest hovel, the same table has been spread, and that bread has been eaten and that cup has been drunk in remembrance of the one Lord, by His people in every age and in every land, showing forth His death, aye, showing forth their one faith in that one sacrifice once offered for sins, by the one High Priest on the one altar of Calvary.

In thinking of this we try to forget the many lamentable, we might almost say the fantastic, exceptions to this rule of the Church of Christ in all time and in every place; the many who have eaten that bread and drunk that cup, that have been Christians only in name; the many that, though Christians indeed, have never, to their sin and shame, eaten and drunk at that table; those to whom I have already alluded, who have per-

* On the author once venturing to suggest, in conversation with the late Bishop Jacobson, of Chester, that the words in 2 Peter i. 19 should read thus—"whereunto ye do well that take heed in your hearts—as unto a lamp shining in a dark place, until the day dawn and the day-star arise," the learned bishop intimated that he was inclined to the same opinion; and on turning to the passage in a Greek Testament which he had with him as a travelling companion, found and showed the author that it was so punctuated there, with a comma after *ἀνατείλῃ*. The words *ὡς λυχνῳ . . . ἀνατείλῃ* were thus virtually put in parenthesis, and *προσέχοντες* connected with *ἐν ταῖς καρδίαις ὑμῶν*.

suaded themselves, or been persuaded by false teachers, that this eating and drinking was not according to the will of Christ who ordained it; Rome's fearful corruptions of the ordinance and her daring to forbid, for many a century now, the drinking of that cup to the laity of her communion.

I would rather think and speak of what our Lord intended, and what to so great an extent has been done at His command, in spite of human frailty and human sin—at His command issued to His Apostles, and through His Apostles to all His disciples, on the night in which He was betrayed, on the very eve of His death upon the cross; and in view of not only His approaching departure in death and resurrection and ascension to the Father who sent Him, but of His return in power and glory to take to Him His great power and to reign. Yes, for the words of our text, "till He come," seem an echo of those mysterious words which He spake at that last supper, "Verily, I say unto you, I will drink no more of the fruit of the vine, until that day that I drink it new with you in the kingdom of God."

And you remember how the Passover-feasting on the slain lamb and the bitter herbs was to go on through the night, "until the morning," or at least how often that expression, "until the morning," occurs in the legal ordinance of that very feast, at the close of which, and arising, as it were, of it, the greater and more simple Christian feast—so similar to it—was instituted. In the morning there was to be, and there was, a deliverance, and a redemption for them out of the land of Egypt, out of the house of bondage. We also are watching for the morning; the night is far spent, and the day is at hand. We are waiting for redemption. Our redemption draweth nigh; our Redeemer, our Deliverer, is at hand. Christ, our Passover, is sacrificed for us, and we are keeping the feast on our slain Lamb ever since. We will keep it, the Church of God will keep it, *till He comes*. My brethren, let us enter into, and let us seek to abide in, the spirit of our text, its strong calm faith in Christ's atoning death as the sacrifice for our sins, and in His blood cleansing us from all sin; its undoubting faith that He is risen from that death, is ascended to heaven, and is at God's right in glory, in heaven with God for us; and its assured hope and joyful expectation of His coming again. It is the very spirit in which we should, time after time, meet around His table, and the spirit in which we meet there is just the spirit in which our whole lives should be passed—the spirit that should pervade and hallow and gladden and purify every hour of the every-day life of every Christian. Our whole lives should be filled with Eucharistic joy, should be spent in holy blood-bought communion with our reconciled Father and with His Son Jesus Christ, in loving fellowship with all saints. Our whole lives should be brightened, every day of each Christian year, with advent hopes of His coming again, and of our being glorified with Him at His coming again.

And He is coming again. This earth is His, the uttermost part of it and the darkest corner of it, all is His, and will yet own Him as its King and Lord. It is the birthplace of the God-man. The incarnation binds Him to it and to us. He has purchased it with His precious blood; He will yet claim the purchased possession. The very act in which His enemies cast Him out of the vineyard and slew Him, in which they most loudly declared, "We will not have this man to reign over us"—the very crucifixion of Christ—was the payment of the redemption price of this world. He went away, but not for ever. He never intended to remain away. He always said He would return. He is waiting in the most holy place, aye, waiting on the right hand of the throne of God—waiting and expecting the day and the hour of His coming back again. Man refused Him the kingdom, but God has given Him the kingdom, and He shall yet take possession of the kingdom, and reign over this world in that kingdom of God which shall be to earth's remotest bounds "righteousness and peace and joy in the Holy Ghost." The kingdom over this world shall yet become the kingdom of our Lord and of His Christ, and He shall reign for ever and ever. But never "till He comes." The kingdom of God as it is now will go on much as it is now—better, we hope, worse, we fear—now spreading and deepening, now narrowing and shallowing. Evil men and seducers will, we know, wax worse and worse. The Spirit speaketh expressly that in the last days perilous times shall come. The Gospel of the kingdom shall, indeed, be preached in all the world and to every nation, for a witness unto all nations, and for the gathering of God's elect out of every nation and kindred and tongue and people. But the tares and the wheat will grow together until the harvest, which is the end of the age; and I fear the tares will, before the end, have nearly crowded the wheat out of the field. "When the Son of Man cometh, shall He find the faith on the earth?" It will be so, more or less darkly, all through the night until the morning, and it would seem the darkest hour of all the night will be that before the dawn. But the morning cometh, the day is at hand. The Sun of Righteousness will yet arise and flood this whole world with His beams of life and light and healing. Very soon then shall there be a converted world at the feet of Jesus, and every knee shall bow to Him, and every tongue confess that Jesus Christ is Lord, to the glory of God the Father. The earth shall then and thus be full of the knowledge of, not only the grace, but the glory of the Lord, as the waters cover the sea.

Then, indeed, the simple solemn ordinance in which we show the Lord's death in eating that bread and drinking that cup may possibly cease. The word "*till* He come" may, but does not necessarily, imply that. It may well give place to some

glorious festal ordinance more suited to glorified saints in the presence of their King in all His beauty, and to some festivity on earth for those still in mortal bodies, more suited to the kingdom then come with power than to the Church now waiting in patient hope for Christ's appearing and kingdom.

Sure we are that never, in all the eternal future of His everlasting kingdom and glory, and of our glory with Him, will it be for one moment forgotten that He died for our sins; that He was slain, and hath redeemed us to God by His blood. It is the Lamb that was slain that is on the throne of God now, and will yet sit down on His own throne and reign over this wide world as the subjugated and reconciled kingdom of God for ever and ever. His redeeming, dying love, will be the unceasing theme of saints and angels to all eternity. May it fill our hearts now and constrain us not only to praise and magnify Him with our lips, but to serve Him and live to Him day by day "till He come!"

LOOKING UNTO JESUS.

SERMON BY THE REV. JAMES SILVESTER, M.A., CURATE-IN-CHARGE OF CUBLINGTON, BUCKS.

"Looking unto Jesus, the Author and Finisher of our faith."—HEBREW xii. 2.

"*Ἀφορῶντες εἰς τὸν τῆς πίστεως ἀρχηγὸν καὶ τελειωτὴν Ἰησοῦν.*"

THE Hebrew Christians, to whom this epistle was addressed stood in imminent danger of unbelief and apostasy. The sect of the Nazarenes was everywhere spoken against, and the followers of Christ were everywhere persecuted and oppressed. At the same time the solemn sacrifices of the Temple continued to be offered, and its gorgeous ritual continued to be observed. Thus the sons of Israel, who had cast in their lot with the Lord Jesus seemed to be adherents of a failing cause and sharers of a forlorn hope. It was necessary, therefore, to use the most pressing exhortations in order to induce them to "hold fast the confession of their faith without wavering," and to "hold fast the confidence and the rejoicing of the hope firm unto the end." And so in illustration of the power of persevering faith, the writer brings forward in review faith's heroes of old time. They now, within the veil, have entered on the inheritance of promise, and form a radiant cloud of witnesses around the saints of God as they press forward in the way to reach the heavenly crown. Let this thought therefore encourage them, freed from every weight of guilt and care, and every entanglement of selfishness and sin, to run with patience the race set before them, ever looking off from themselves and the world, unto Jesus the Author and Finisher of their faith.

Our text speaks of (1) faith and its exercise, (2) faith and its author, (3) faith and its object.

I. FAITH AND ITS EXERCISE.—"Looking unto Jesus." We cannot make too much of real faith. It is the life of spirituality; it is the essence of religion; it is the motive-power of godliness. Indeed, faith, in the general sense of the word, represents the mightiest principle in the world. "All men have not faith," writes St. Paul of Christian belief as a spiritual principle; but all men have faith as a principle of social action. In the labour for daily bread, in the operations of husbandry and agriculture, in the transactions of business, in the personal relations of life, in the functions of government, and in all the affairs of the world, faith is everywhere present. No man could live without faith, though few comparatively realize that they are continually under its influence. The scriptural definition of faith applies as well to the life that now is as to that which is to come, for in either aspect it is "the substance of things hoped for, the evidence of things not seen."

This being so, wherein differs the common faith of men from that through which come justification and life eternal? If all men have faith, how is it that all men are not the children of God and heirs of eternal life? The answer is that Christian faith has a higher and wider range than the common faith of mankind. All men have faith in their dealings with men, but all men have not the faith that leadeth unto God. All men have faith to guide them on earth, but all men have not faith to lift up their hearts to heaven. Thus Christian faith differs from common faith by reason of the objects which it contemplates. Christian faith "bodies forth the things unseen" of heavenly communion and grace divine. It beholds Him who is invisible, and enters within the veil. It enables us to apprehend the eternal power and Godhead, and to have fellowship with that divine Life which was manifested in human flesh for our salvation. It prepares our spirit for the indwelling of the Spirit of God, and opens our heart for the reception of spiritual blessing. And of faith as of prayer may it be said that it

> soars on high
> Through Jesus to the throne,
> And moves the Hand which moves the world,
> To bring salvation down.

Such is Christian faith, and so simple is its action that it is here described as a "looking." Faith has been called "the eye of the soul," and like the outward eye it must, to be healthy, be in active exercise, "looking" and "looking unto Jesus." Indeed in its whole character faith is fitly and beautifully represented by the seeing eye. That delicate organ is sensible of the slightest impression, and is most simple of action as silently it opens to the light and receives each image of the external world. So faith is tenderly susceptible in all its relations, and opens the heart to all spiritual realities as it regards the things above where Christ sitteth at the right hand of God. The human eye

has been compared alike to a microscope and a telescope, and faith, after the same comparison, makes clear to us the mysteries of earth, and brings near to us the far-off joys of heaven. Like Moses on Pisgah, it gazes in rapturous thought upon the land of God's promise. Like Abraham, it looks for the city which hath foundations whose builder and maker is God. Like the favourite apostles on the slopes of snow-capped Hermon, it is an eye-witness of the majesty and glory of Christ. Oh, beware of departing from the simplicity of faith as an act and a habit of spiritual looking. Beware of allowing any known sin to dim the power of inward vision. It is said that the human eye is more commonly diseased in India than in our own country, and this is attributed to the greater personal uncleanliness prevailing there. And in like manner the farther men depart from purity of thought and life, the greater will be their blindness to spiritual things. The more we resemble God, the clearer is our sight of Him. "Blessed are the pure in heart, for they shall see God."

II. Faith and its Author. — "Jesus the Author and Finisher of our faith." There are two ways in which the Lord Jesus Christ may be regarded as the Author of our faith, either as He has led the way of faith Himself in His life on earth, or as now He endues His people with faith by His Holy Spirit sent down from heaven. The use of the word in other places in the New Testament shows that our Lord is clearly the great Leader in the faith. St. Peter, in his sermon in Solomon's Porch, denounces the conduct of his fellow-countrymen in killing "the *Prince* of life," (Acts iii. 15), the word translated "Prince" being the same as that translated "Author" in our text. And again in this very epistle the same word is diversely rendered when Christ is spoken of as "the *Captain* of salvation" (Heb. ii. 10). We understand then that the Lord Jesus Christ is the great Exemplar of faith, and that He has gone before us that we may follow in His steps. It was in the power of faith that he lived our life, suffered its privations, endured its trials, was proof against all its sin. "Man shall not live by bread alone, but by every word that proceedeth out of the mouth of God" (Matt. iv. 4), was his answer to the first of Satan's great temptations in the wilderness. "My meat is to do the will of Him that sent me, and to finish His work" (John iv. 34), was His word to His disciples concerning the food He had to eat which they knew not of. "Not my will but Thine be done" (Luke xxii. 42), is the prayer of the Son of Man which gives His life over to seemingly certain failure and disgrace, but which in truth secures the redemption of the world. All such language is the language of truest faith, and well may Jesus be called faith's Leader as thus He illustrates its principles and its power. For "for the joy that was set before Him," as we are told in the context, He "endured the cross, despising the shame, and is set down at the right hand of the throne of God." So

> Trace we the babe who hath retrieved our loss,
> From His poor manger to the bitter cross;
> Tread in His steps assisted by His grace,
> Till man's first heavenly state again takes place.

But it had been comparatively little for our Lord to leave us an example—albeit the brightest example—of faith, for we are without strength of our own to follow Him. He, however, from His throne on high, sends down the succours of His salvation, and is "the Author of eternal salvation unto all them that obey Him" (Heb. v. 9). "By Him," as St. Peter says, we "believe in God that raised Him from the dead, and gave Him glory that our faith and hope might be in God" (1 Peter i. 21). The Holy Spirit who is sent in the Saviour's name comes to convict the world of sin in that they believe not in Him, and to impart to returning sinners that faith which believes to the saving of the soul. According to his own word the Son of God utters his voice from above, and many a heart dead in tresspasses and sins springs into life at the call, and enters on that blessed fellowship of faith that shall never pass away. For the Author of the faith is described in our text as the Finisher or Perfecter of our faith likewise. Of Him it is written that "by one offering He hath perfected for ever them that are sanctified" (Heb. x. 14), and now, having found acceptance with God for them in Himself, He worketh out for them the gracious purpose of his will to bring them to His own glory. Their final salvation shall be a perfect work, and He will not rest until He set them before His face in heaven for ever. He has sat down on the right hand of the throne of God, and they shall at length share His throne. He has set them to win the race of faith, and He is waiting to give them the prize of their high calling when they have endured to the end. He has begun a good work in them, and He will bring it to completion for the day of His appearing. He will supply what is lacking in their faith, as when He revealed to His disciples the necessity and manner of His own death, and this He will do by deepening their knowledge of divine truth and of their own calling. Through the events and circumstances of their lives He will strengthen their faith as He strengthened His apostles' faith when in answer to prayer He lifted His voice above the stormy waters and bade the waves be still. Nor will He cease to inspire the universal Church in the ministration of His word and ordinances until, as St. Paul says, "we all come into the unity of the faith, and of the knowledge of the Son of God, unto a perfect man, unto the measure of the stature of the fulness of Christ" (Eph. iv. 13). For faith, like grace,

> shall to the end
> Brighter and brighter shine;
> Nor present things nor things to come
> Shall quench the spark divine.

III. Faith and Its Object.—"Looking unto

Jesus." True Christian faith can rest only in the heart of Him from whom it comes. His name is sweetest music to the ear of faith. His work is the great and only foundation on which it can build its assurance of acceptance with God. His person is faith's highest desire and delight. "Let me see Thy face, let me hear Thy voice," cries faith to her Lord, "for sweet is Thy voice,and Thy countenance is comely." Rest short of nothing, therefore, ye that seek the Lord, of this bright and blessed exercise of faith "looking unto Jesus." Look not at yourselves except that you may with greater longing and great love look unto Him. There is no comfort to be had in the creature apart from the Creator. Let the consciousness of your guilt and sinfulness move you to look unto Jesus that you may be saved from all condemnation. Let the sense of your weakness and proneness to sin fix your steadfast gaze of trust in Him who is able to save to the uttermost all that come unto God by Him. Failures and imperfections and besetting faults would draw your head downwards and cause you to brood in darkness over your own sorry self. But look up! See Jesus crucified, see Jesus crowned, and claim therein your heritage of faith, even the death unto sin and the new life unto righteousness. Look unto Jesus, and find in that looking peace and healing, and joy and power. Look not even to your faith, for faith can never be worthy of the Saviour. "The eye that sees all things sees not itself," and faith, in gazing on Jesus, thinks not of itself but only of its glorious object, as the image of Jesus in all His grace and truth appears within the soul.

Look off unto Jesus then, and let this be your daily endeavour. Look unto Him as the Author of strength for daily duty, and set Him before you in all your work. Let your prayer be

> Teach me, my God and King,
> In all things Thee to see,
> And what I do in any thing,
> To do it unto Thee.

Look unto Jesus in every pleasure and recognize in Him the Giver of every good and perfect gift and the Spring of all our joys. Look unto Jesus in every temptation and find in Him grace to withstand in the evil hour, and when you have done all to stand. Look unto Jesus when the shadow of bereavement falls across your path, and He will prove to you that He is "a friend that sticketh closer than a brother." Look unto Jesus amid all the strife and turmoil of this world, and He will help you to bear your cross, and cause you to rejoice in all suffering for Him. Look unto Jesus as your life is renewed day by day, and as your eyes open to the light of the sun so let your faith behold the face of your Saviour. Look unto Jesus as night closes upon you and you go to share the sleep He gives to His beloved, and the darkness shall be light about you as by faith you repose in His bosom. Look unto Jesus and Jesus only, look unto Jesus now, and look unto Him always and for ever. And presently you shall have a clearer sight than that of faith, for within the veil you shall "see the King in his beauty, and behold the land that is very far off."

> Behold the Lamb of God who bore
> Thy burden on the tree;
> He died the captives to restore,
> His blood was shed for thee.
>
> Look to Him till the sight endears
> The Saviour to thy heart;
> His pierced side bedew with tears,
> Nor from His cross depart.
>
> Look to Him till His perfect love
> Thy every act control,
> Its vast constraining influence prove
> O'er body, spirit, soul.
>
> Look to Him as the race you run,
> Your never-failing Friend,
> He will complete the work begun,
> And grace in glory end.

THE Rev. H. H. Ramsay, Fellow of St. Augustine's College, Canterbury, has accepted the post of Vice-Principal of Wells Theological College, which will become vacant at Easter.

THE *Rock* hears that the Bishop of Manchester has returned from Bournemouth to Bishop's Court. "He has been taking seaweed baths for rheumatism in the shoulder, contracted at the Church Congress, and has, we believe, derived relief from the treatment."

THE subscription list for a testimonial to Principal Owen, of Lampeter College, and late Dean of St. Asaph, has been closed, and amounts to about £150. At a meeting of the committee, held at St. Asaph on Wednesday, it was resolved to present Principal Owen with a massive silver inkstand and a cheque for the balance, he having intimated that it is his intention to devote the money to purchasing books for the use of the Junior Clergy Reading Association.

THE following have been elected to the new House of Laymen for the Province of Canterbury as representatives of the London diocese:—Mr. F. A. Bevan, Lord Cranborne, Chancellor Dibdin, Sir Walter Phillimore, Mr. Athelstan Riley, Mr. J. A. Shaw-Stewart, Mr. P. V. Smith, Mr. G. A. Spottiswoode, Mr. Eugene Stock, Mr. J. G. Talbot, M.P. Mr. R. B. Prosser is the only member of the late House who has lost his seat. Sir Walter Phillimore and Mr. Athelstan Riley are new members.

ON Sunday week the Rev. Samuel Smith, rector of Kingsdown, Sevenoaks, a well-known preacher in his time, and the oldest graduate of Trinity College, Cambridge, entered upon his ninetieth year. Prayers were read by the curate, the Rev. A. B. Rogers, and the sermon was preached by the Rev. Haskett Smith, son of the rector. The venerable priest, who is in excellent health, was, notwithstanding the severe weather, present as usual at the service, and at its close gave the blessing. It may be interesting to mention that as far back as the year 1828 (and the four succeeding years) Mr. Samuel Smith was chaplain to the Lord Mayor of London, and over sixty years ago (in 1832) he was appointed to his first living, St. George's, Camberwell, which he held for fifty-three years.

NOTICES.

All communications respecting the Literary portion of the paper should be addressed to the Editor.

Business communications of every kind should be addressed to Mr. S. Gibbon. at the Church of England Pulpit Office, 160, Fleet Street, London, E.C., to whom cheques and Post-office orders for subscriptions (in advance), three months, 2s., six months, 3s. 6d., twelve months, 6s. 6d., are to be made payable.

The Cases for binding Vol. XXXIV. are now ready.

For Health and Immortality.

The Ecclesiastical Review.

SATURDAY, JANUARY 21, 1893.

"THE POOR CLERGY."

ONCE more the cry is "Poor Clergymen"—we wish it had more chance of being listened to. Whoever else has doubt about the badness of the times, the poor parson has none when the yearly Tithe Commutation Table informs him that his income has taken one step nearer vanishing point. A nominal 25 per cent. at least has been knocked off clerical incomes, actually the reduction has been much greater. The latest suggestion is that the bishops should deal with the affair by a general appeal to the laity, and by a levy upon church offertories.

The poverty of the clergy is no new thing; men who were always poor are now poorer, that is the only novelty. The bishops have always been aware of the struggling life of many of their poorer brethren. But they have made no concerted effort to deal with it—more from want of power than want of will. In good sooth it is very hard for bishops to get along as it is, and the scribes of the *Guardian* would know that if they were bishops. Not even the parsons take as law the word of their ordinary, certainly laymen would not. And an appeal for funds issued by my lord of Barchester might fall as flat as one issued by Mr. Jones, if the object did not strongly appeal to the imagination of those appealed to. And, unfortunately, there is nothing sentimental or romantic about a shabby-genteel incumbent. The street Arab is picturesque (on paper), the Salvation Army is at least striking, the poor parson is only hard-worked and underpaid; when it comes to arousing popular sympathy he is dull, compared even to a docker. Therefore we have no great hope of an appeal to the public, and we do not much think the bishops will unite to make one.

Nor is there much prospect of a levy on offertories. Already a good many fingers dip into the plate. Incumbents have pressing parochial needs and urgent outside calls, they cannot afford to give away offertories. Moreover, the same objection holds good as to a general subscription. Congregations do not always show a very vivid interest in the incumbent of their own parish, still less in that of the next; and when it comes to the case of Mr. Quiverful on the other side of the county, they are very likely to button up their pockets or stay away from church.

Something might be done by utilising existing funds. The country bristles with clergy charities of one kind and another. Only those that are educational are worth preserving. The rest, which are merely machinery for distributing doles, might well be thrown into the melting-pot. Charities which deal out five and ten-pound notes after heartrending appeals, which dignify neither those that make or those that take them, might be spared with advantage—a great economy would be made by doing away with all the manifold expenses of distributing each separate fund, centralising the whole, and handing the money over to the bishops for the permanent augmentation of as many poor livings as possible.

Something further might be done by following the precedent just set at Norwich, and attaching a poor living to all canonries that still possess an income. The almost invariable practice is to give these "plums" to men who already hold well-endowed preferments.

A further result might be reached by amalgamating parishes. With rare exceptions, there is no reason for confining a clergyman's labours to a few score inhabitants, and yet many benefices have a population of less than three hundred, all told, and some of these not the poorest. And the last plan would be to make some radical alteration in our present system of clerical work. St. Paul always stood out that those that preach the Gospel should live by the Gospel. It is the plain duty of every congregation to support their own minister, not necessarily any one else's minister—herein lies the fallacy of a popular appeal—but their own. When all possible has been done in the way of redistributing charities and endowments, there will still be many ill-paid cures, and many will be beyond even mission efforts. Ought these not to be served by a different class of clergy? If, say, £100 a year is the most that can be provided for a certain district, why must a man go there whose standard requires an income of at least £200? Non-conformist societies contrive, so to speak, to cut their coat according to their cloth. We do not say that their fashion should be our fashion. But we cannot see why an impossible standard should be pretended to. Which is more dignified, to serve a

parish with £100 a year by means of a man who is worth and who wants double that, and who is always begging for the balance, or to openly send a man whose social position and requirements do not demand more than he gets? Wide differences in social level exist already among clergymen. The men who rise to high positions are recognised as of a different class to those who can never hope for similar promotion, and the two classes rarely meet except on official occasions, and even then they do not mix. Bishops may extend their right hands to all their clergy alike, but each man knows, metaphorically, how many fingers he is allowed to take. Some are asked to dinner, some never get beyond a call, most cannot expect to rise above a cup of tea taken standing at a visitation or a ruri-decanal conference. This being so, why not extend the limit a little and appoint men to the residuum of poor livings who will not be out of place there? That, and the development of lay work, seems to us the only way to permanently improve the present state of things. Use all existing means to increase as many incomes as possible, and choose for the remainder incumbents who will be satisfied with what they get, always providing that the redistribution does away with the prevalent present evil, that those who have most work are worst paid.

PROFESSOR THOULET ON SCIENTIFIC WARFARE.

THE *Herald of Peace* reports that Professor J. Thoulet, in a recent address to the Academy of Sciences, at Nancy, in France, made some excellent observations. In eloquent language he said:—

"All peoples and communities are tending to mutual union. The Piedmontese, the Tuscans, the Neapolitans, and the Sicilians have become Italians. The Castilians, the Galicians, the Andalusians and the Valencians have become Spaniards. The Hanoverians, the Badeners, the Bavarians, the Saxons and the Mecklenburgers have become Germans. The Bretons, the Provençals, the Bourguignons, and the Gascons have become Frenchmen. And gradually, in the future, the French, the English, the Italians, the Germans, the Spaniards, will only bear the comprehensive noble name and title of men and brethren.

"For, indeed, are we not all the same? Do we not all share in the weakness of infancy, and in the youthful joys of love and energetic life; and as the years roll on, they bring to all of us, as kindred of the same blood, similar trials, tears, and mortality.

"*Ad augusta per angusta.* Through pain, joy, love, grief, and death, we are marching on towards a grand ultimate peace; the peace which we long for with body and soul. And we shall reach it. Everything is tending to this end.

"Science, as the benefactress of human kind, even whilst placing in the hands of the weakest a terrible force, capable of annihilating fortresses, armaments, and entire battalions, is devising the destruction of war itself. Actual facts are tending in this direction. For mutual enemies are already beginning to apprehend that the battles of the future will be victories for neither party, but rather defeats for both; and that if any survivors are left, they will only be witnesses, but without glory, of the piled corpses of their antagonists, mingled promiscuously with the bodies of their own comrades, in one vast and hideous charnel-heap. Cities and nations will be so devastated by the new warfare; industry and commerce will be so irreparably ruined: widows and orphans will be so numerous, that, on either side, the first discharge of artillery will destroy hope; for courage, skill, and superior numbers will avail no longer. There will only remain the certainty of mutual annihilation, fatal and inevitable for the strong, slain by iron or by fire; whilst for the weak, the women and the children, there will be left death from misery and starvation.

"Hence future appeals to the dread arbitrament of battle will become gloomy acts of insanity and of awful risks beyond calculation. The final battles will efface the combatants on both sides, and will thus avenge the desperate folly of such unnatural strife. In fact, war itself will die. And this result is even already beginning."

This able address, so admirably suited to the professorial chair and so exemplary as a model for all instructors of youth, has excited considerable interest in France, and forms the subject of a special article by Dr. Charles Richet, in the *Scientific Review*, published in Paris.

DIVINE ECLECTICISM.

By the Rev. M. B. HOGG, B.A., Rector of Keady, Ireland.

Exposition of Romans ix. 13.

It is a curious fact, to which I suppose your attention has been more than once directed, that God's gifts and graces bestowed, so lavishly and unsparingly, are usually imparted without, so far as we can discern, much qualifying worthiness on the part of man. The very people who receive the Divine blessing, frequently display, not only reluctance to acknowledge the blessing, but also a striking unfitness to receive it at all.

Eminent instances of Divine favour bestowed, apparently, without any conditions that we can discover, are easily traceable in the pages of sacred story. No one supposes that, looking at the question superficially, Jacob was a better man than Esau. In fact the more carefully you analyse the constituents of his character, the more irresistibly are you driven to the conclusion

that, as we should nowadays estimate it, that character was in most respects, vastly inferior to that of his elder and more impetuous brother. Esau was ingenuous, unsuspicious, of frank and chivalrous temperament. Jacob was double-dealing and incredulous, in short, a worldly-wise schemer without one particle of youthful sentiment in his strange and oddly mixed composition. Esau was a man of athletic cast, of robust, hardy frame, whose aspirations soared no higher th an the number of animals he could wound in the chase, or the manner in which he could outstrip all competitors in the hunting-field. Jacob was unskilled in these manly pursuits. Like his father, he devoted himself possibly to "serious thought at eventide," or to attention to domestic duties, qualities which some people, doubtless, would categorise to-day as effeminate and childish. Moreover he could equivocate, and pretend, and plot, and deceive, and all these unworthy qualities were absent from the open, outspoken nature of Esau. He seems to have been a master of shifts, and tricks, and "dodges," for not only did he succeed in duping his aged father, but he also overcame the scruples of his too partial mother. (Is there a mother to-day, I wonder, who for the sake of "advancing" one child's interests, would ruthlessly sacrifice those of another, not caring a jot whether that other should sink or swim?)

Even his outraged and cruelly wronged brother Esau was for the moment a victim to his artifice on more than one remarkable occasion. He seems to have hoodwinked his wideawake father-in-law, and to have aroused the ire of that subtle individual by his unexampled shrewdness in business transactions. Whatever he touched turned to gold. Wherever he went he prospered. Even the "angel of the Lord," that mystic "man who wrestled with him until break of day," was obliged to concede the blessing he craved, and to acknowledge his dogged determination to win at all hazards. Why then is this patriarchal "sharper" singled out by God to perpetuate His chosen seed, and work His sovereign will? As well ask why God selected an idolater's son from among many tribes and people, and made him "father of the faithful." As well demand the reason why a man of stammering lips and trembling speech should have been chosen to solidify the scattered and degenerate hosts of Israel, and lead them into view of the land of promise. As well ask me to assign causes for the deposition of the knightly and somewhat ascetic Saul, and the exaltation of the youthful and sensuous David to the kingly dignity. As well inquire why the Son of God should have become at His incarnation, a peasant woman's son; or why the most indefatigable and capable pioneer of early Christianity should have formed one of the band that stoned the saintly Stephen.

I am not a fatalist, but I can only account for the existence of such things thus: "Hath not the potter power over the clay, to make of the same lump one vessel to honour and another to dishonour."

I am not what, for lack of a better term, may be called a supra-lapsarian; that is, one who believes that God chose out a small definite mass of people to be His own, and positively *decreed* that all others, whether they liked it or not, should be doomed to eternal disfavour; but it is impossible to resist the conviction that God has mysterious ways of dealing and of acting, and that undoubtedly it behoves the Christian to give all diligence to make his calling and election sure. Salvation is by no means the easy, good-humoured, self-satisfied thing that maudlin sentimentalists would fain make it. For if even the righteous shall with difficulty, and after hard fighting, be saved, where shall the ungodly and the sinner appear?

Scientists of the Darwinian school (and be it remembered that Darwinianism rightly interpreted is not necessarily an anti-Christian theory), account for the evolution and ultimate development of man from a lower species by a process called "Natural Selection." I am not alarmed at the assertion, because it is just as conceivable that the body of man should have evolved from some lower order of created things, as that a flower should develop from seed, or waving corn from common ugly grain. And I dare say the apostolic dictum. "It doth not yet appear what we shall be," has in this sense a retrospective as well as a prospective signification. Such a Christian *littérateur* as George Macdonald, therefore, in all piety, and with due reverence may term man the "cauliflower of the spine," and pour ridicule thick and fast as hail on the contention of the atheist, who, amid noble ecclesiastical surroundings, and the awe-inspiring silence of an ancient graveyard, declared with sinister malevolence that Christianity is the one thing that in these days takes the crab's move backwards.

What the principle of "Selection" is in Nature (according to Darwin), so is it possibly in Revelation. God does indubitably select the best and fittest both in Nature and in grace, the unsuitable elements are rejected like the men who in Gideon's army bowed down upon their knees to drink; the good are eliminated from the useless unprofitable mass as the 300 who "lapped the water as a dog lappeth." A Jacob may seem to us greedy and selfish and callous, but his inner consciousness must have been more deeply saturated with the infinite than that of Esau. A David may appear to have committed, as we think, an all but unpardonable sin; but it is abundantly evident that both these men, the patriarchal "sharper" and the royal libertine, despite their undoubted failings, were possessed of spiritual insight, were imbued with inner qualities which in God's sight more than counterbalanced the absence of some particular virtues.

And that God has used such, and is daily using such, to effect His purposes and elaborate His schemes ought to silence our thoughtless and ill-considered condemnation of the slips and falls our neighbours sometimes make. The crafty trickster of our text (as we esteem him), became the father of kingly Judah, and the ancestor, according to the flesh, of holy Jesus, while generous Esau, who never feared the face of foeman either in the battle or in the chase, attained no higher distinction than to become the founder of a race which was afterwards tributary to Israel. Thus the principle of our text is elucidated. "Jacob have I loved, Esau have I hated."

II. Now, in the second place, to examine our subject more closely, be it observed that when these words "hate" and "love" are applied to God, they convey quite another meaning than is usually attached to them. We speak of "love" as indicating the strongest possible benevolent affection, and of "hate" as referring to the highest and most intense degree of animosity. But these are merely human definitions and are therefore of necessity, inadequate. God's "love" is not as man's, God's "hate" is not as man's, simply because these qualities partake of no human elements. The quality of sin (ἔρος) and that of finality do not enter into God's love or hate. When, therefore,

God says "Jacob have I loved, Esau have I hated," understand Him as meaning something more terribly different from, and presumably of higher importance than, the feelings that dwell in the bosoms of His creatures. With men and women of the world, the "love," as it is termed, generally subsists until something arises to divert it from its object; the hate is a more savage quality, and generally lasts while life lasts. It is deplorable, but it is true, that in the case of most people you meet, an injury, or a fancied slight, or a disparaging word, or a thoughtless criticism is never forgotten, and, therefore, never forgiven, while the good done by the same individual is utterly ignored and overlooked. Now, if God were so extreme to mark what is "done amiss, who may abide it?" Happily, however, His love and hate are of a different texture. They are divine, and that constitutes the difference. The love is "everlasting," the hate is transitory, and at its worst only conditional While His very Essence and Being are love, hate as we understand the phrase has no place in His character, it is merely the absence of love. Mark this point, I pray you. To love His creatures, to provide for them, to sustain and bless them, is essentially the distinguishing characteristic of God. Not to do so, the absence of these active tokens of His favour, is His hate. Who will run the risk of this to-day?

Amongst the early Christians, there was a sect of religious speculators called Gnostics, who maintained extravagant pretensions as to knowledge and insight of God's workings with humanity. They found it so hard to reconcile what was stated in the Old Testament as to the remorseless and saturnine character of the God of the Hebrews with the bennvolent attributes ascribed to Him in the New Testament, that they conceived the idea that the God of the Old Testament was an inferior being to the God of the New. They therefore called the God who conversed with Adam in Paradise, who spoke to Moses in the flaming bush, the Demiurge—one who was subordinate to the great God of all the eternities, whose name is Love. This Demiurge, according to Gnostic conception, punished with direful vengeance all those who, whether deservedly or not, were obnoxious to Him. His favour was altogether arbitrary, His dealings partial. His favourites were those who in reality were men of inferior calibre, such as Jacob, David, Solomon, while such persons as Cain, Esau, Saul, and others were the actual favourites of the Higher Being who dwelt in the *pleroma*.

Gnosticism obviously made the grand mistake unthinking and short sighted theologians make to-day. It regarded God's judicial displeasure as His essential and eternal nature, whereas it was only the side-light of His character, all the glowing phases of which were not fully displayed to man until the fulness of the time was come and God sent forth His Son. Nor is there, to a spiritual mind, any vital distinction between such a revealed truth as that God is Love, and such a pre-Christian declaration as "He is merciful and gracious, slow to anger and of great kindness, and repenteth Him of the evil."

To understand our text aright, therefore, you must remove absolutely and thoroughly from your minds the grossly human and imperfect conception of God's love and hate which from the very nature of the case you must entertain, and then you may possibly arrive at some faint notion of the meaning of the statement. God did not hate Esau as many people would a man whom they despised or wished to injure. He knew, as we cannot, that wayward heart, and had thoroughly weighed and sifted, by processes unknown to us, that frank but imperfect character. He had found him wanting in the fervent piety and trustful faith which, despite his meanness and cupidity, Jacob indubitably possessed, and therefore He simply passed him over (not in the Sublapsarian* sense), just as He passed over Reuben, Cain, Manasseh, Eli, Saul, or the rejected sons of Jesse. He loved Jacob, not with the fond, undue preference his foolish mother Rebecca exhibited towards her youngest born, and which caused her to treat her eldest child with indifference and injustice, but with that gratified feeling of approbation and satisfaction with which you would regard the child who gave you no anxiety as to his future, who early trod the paths of piety, and exhibited the matchless qualities of religious fervour and outward decorum.

CORRESPONDENCE.

To the Editor of the CHURCH OF ENGLAND PULPIT AND ECCLESIASTICAL REVIEW.

THE TEMPTATION IN EDEN.

SIR,—Mr. Donaldson has again in reply to some strictures of mine, favoured your readers with a continuation of his *Apologia pro dogmate suo*, on the above subject. He allows that the serpent is a figurative term, and that the imprecation uttered against it, is figurative language; but what he fails to see, is that this figurative language is distinctly adapted to a real, living ophidian, and not to such a spiritual tempter as he represents it to be. I take it that plain, simple readers of Genesis, from the date of its publication to the Christian Era, if not later, took the serpent to be a serpent, Heb. *nachash*, and nothing else. Why, the word occurs thirty-one times in the Old Testament; it is not synonomous with Satan, as Mr. Donaldson knows very well, though, in Isaiah, it is twice used to describe "the leviathan, the piercing and crooked serpent," *livyathan*, which Goldziher identifies with the storm-cloud and its lightning, and therefore in these instances may be connected with oriental Nature-worship; it is used to describe one of the Hebrew patriarchs, "Dan shall be a serpent by the way," without any implied reproof in the mouth of his aged father, Jacob (Gen. xiv. 17), who probably gave the other name for serpent, Levi (from *livyathan*) to another of his sons; and lastly, as the brazen serpent (Numb. xxi. 9), it is used by Moses, the author of Genesis, I presume, in Mr. Donaldson's opinion, as a healing power and type of our Saviour. To take this one instance only, I maintain that Moses could not, by *nachash*. have intended "devil" in the third chapter of Genesis, and a healing, sin-forgiving type of Christ in Numbers. Your readers, sir, who remember that the interpretation of the serpent as Satan occurs only in the last and most figurative book of the New Testament, will not jumble the serpent and Satan together in the primitive pictorial representation of the Genesis story, much less substitute the one for the other, in obedience to some unhappy dissatisfaction with its simplicity, and this done, still calmly call it history.

* Sublapsarian was one who held that God passed over those whom Christ did not positively favour.

As to the perversion of my views, which I still observe in his last letter, naturally resulting in pity for the nonsense he has created, I will not say more than that I do not claim that "the Hebrews borrowed the story of the Temptation from the Persian theology;" nor do I rank Mazdaism on a par with Christianity; and most certainly I do not "insist on the real existence of Angromainyush and his evil spirits." I submit once more that I only regard them myself as evil personified, either generally or particularly. Mr. Donaldson must have let his knowledge of Plato rust pretty considerably if he cannot realise a mind which has a strong consciousness of evil in the world, and yet without personifying it. The δαιμόνιον of Socrates was a friendly, not a hostile, spirit, and even that he did not personify. The consciousness of a devil does not belong to Greek philosophy. One may, therefore, without being an object of pity, adopt that way of regarding evil. But enough of personalities.

Mr. Donaldson cannot, it appears, entertain the notion of religious interdependence of the Jews and Parsîs. He would have, I presume, the Jewish religion quite *sui generis*, whose appropriate simile would be Minerva, springing, armed *cap-à-pie*, from the head of Jupiter. Let us hear what a Talmudic scholar says, Professor T. Theodores: "There is no doubt that the Jewish exiles adopted many a religious idea and practice from the Iranian fire-worshippers. The Rabbins admit, without disapproval, that the names of the angels are of Babylonian origin. Indeed, there is a mass of evidence to prove that the conceptions of the angelical hierarchy, of the existence and activity of good and evil spirits, of the resurrection of the dead on judgment day, as these ideas are developed and systematised in the Talmud and other Jewish books of that epoch, bore a striking resemblance to articles of faith recognised in the religion of Zoroaster." Again, he says: "The Persians seem to have been regarded by the Hebrews, and probably also the latter by the former, as not very far removed from the truth." These statements manifestly support my claim of interdependence. This claim will be strengthened by the consideration of the fact, insisted on in the Talmud, that the emigration of Jews, under Ezra and other leaders, did not permanently disturb the Jewish settlements in the Persian dominions. The most notable families did not abandon their Mesopotamian settlements, but continued to live in compact communities, according to their own customs, and mainly under their own laws. The constant and friendly intercourse of Jews and Persians for nigh three centuries would inevitably produce that reciprocal influence of religious ideas, which the Talmud, itself written at Babylon, allows, and which shows itself in the story of the Magi, in St. Matthew's Gospel.

But, sir, I do not claim that the story of the Temptation is derived from the Persians, for all their similarity of religious ideas; I am not forgetful that, when the ancestor of the Hebrews migrated from Mesopotamia, he naturally carried with him the cherished traditions of his race. The story in question was one of several such, and it is becoming more and more evident, as Assyro-Babylonian records are discovered and deciphered, that this was the real fact of the case. I have lately given in your pages a statement of Mr. Boscawen's discovery, which bears on the point. I read in the *Thinker* of this month, that Mr. Pinches, of the British Museum, has recently discovered a parallel to the second account of the Creation. As these discoveries multiply, we shall probably all, even Mr. Donaldson, realise distinctly that the Hebrew people were accessible to influences formerly unsuspected. Even some ten years ago, Dr. Driver, preaching before the University of Oxford, said: "It is now known how wide was the diffusion of influences having their home in Babylonia," and he argued that it is not unreasonable to interpret the second and third chapters of Genesis as allegorical; nor does he hesitate to describe the first chapter of that book as containing "a series of representative pictures," an expression closely resembling that of "pictorial representation," which gave so much needless offence to my correspondent. If so learned a scholar as the Regius Professor of Hebrew at Oxford, can use from the University pulpit "representative pictures" for the first chapter of Genesis, why may I not, in a letter, use "pictorical representation" for the third? Mr. Donaldson should, I ween, be censorious towards the reverend professor first, before reproving me?

But, Sir, the time is doubtless coming when any candid man, who is at all acquainted with the results of modern science, involving in this particular case the vast antiquity of man, and of historical criticism, will recognise that the material from which the early history of the race was gradually built up consists, to a great extent of myths, legends, and traditions of rude and unscientific ages. Thus the narrative of the Garden of Eden, with its trees of knowledge and of life, will be an obvious allegory or pictorial representation of the conception of the origin of sin and man's dual nature. The most learned and liberal Anglican divines, for some little time past, are recognising that the use in Scripture of pre-Hebrew elements in nowise impairs its inspiration, but only our false estimate of it; and such men as Canon Driver, Canon Cheyne, and Professor Ryle insist on "the fundamental importance of disengaging the religious from the critical and historical problems of the Old Testament." When this is done and the sources of Genesis fully ascertained, then such views as those of Mr. Donaldson will be consigned to the limbo of forgetfulness.

F. T. P.

PREFERMENTS AND APPOINTMENTS.

Allan, Rev. William, D.D., Vicar of St. James's, Bermondsey; Vicar of St. Mary's, Bungay, Suffolk.

Bingham, Rev. Thomas, M.A.; Chaplain of the Devon House of Mercy, and Curate of Bovey Tracy.

Birch, Rev. Wickham M., M.A., Vicar of Ashburton-with-Buckland-in-the-Moor; Rural Dean of Moreton.

Bishop, Rev. Everett James, M.A.; Rector of Cantley, Norfolk.

Blackburne, Rev. Henry Ireland, M.A., Rector of Warmingham and Honorary Canon of Chester; Vicar of St. Michael and All Angels', Crewe-green.

Blakiston, Rev. Robert, M.A.; Vicar of Fisherton, Delamere, Wilts.

Browne, Rev. W. R.; Licensed Preacher in the Diocese of Ely.

Carr, Rev. E. T. S., M.A.; Rector of Little Shelford, Cambridge.

Carr, Rev. Lawrence Carter, M.A.; Rector of Overstrand, and Rector of Sidestrand, Norfolk (by dispensation).

Dixon, Rev. F. A., M.A., Vicar of Christ Church, Silloth; Vicar of Ivegill, Carlisle.

Eliot, Rev. Edward, B.C.L.; Minister of St. Matthew's Chapel, in the parish of St. Lawrence, Jersey.

Hadfield, Rev. Edward Augustus; Perpetual Curate of South Darley, Derbyshire.

Hanmer, Rev. H., M.A., Vicar of Hanmer; Surrogate for the Diocese of St. Asaph.

Harris, Rev. H. Harrington, M.A.; Rector of Poynings, Sussex.

Hasluck, Rev. Ernest Edward, M.A.; Perpetual Curate of Handley-with-Gussage, St. Andrew's, Salisbury.
Healey, Rev. Wynne, M.A., Senior Curate of Leeds Parish Church; Incumbent of the New District of St. Olave's, Stoke Newington.
Higham, Rev. James Bellamy, Curate-in-Charge of East Claydon; Vicar of Steeple Claydon, Bucks.
Jones, Rev. G. Haines, M.A., Vicar of Awbridge, Romsey; Rector of Nutfield, Surrey.
Kaufmann, Rev. Moritz, M.A.; Rector of Ingworth, Norfolk.
Milne, Rev. J. R., M.A.; Vicar of Rougham, Norfolk.
Morgan, Rev. Samuel Christopher, D.D.; Vicar of Ebrington, Gloucestershire.
Morris, Rev. M. C. F., B.C.L., M.A., Vicar of Newton-on-Ouse; Honorary Secretary York Diocesan Board of Education.
Paterson, Rev. Thomas F., M.A., Vicar of Herrington, Fence Houses, Durham; Rector of Jarrow Grange, Jarrow-on-Tyne.
Pitt, Rev. Richard Warcup, M.A.; Rector of Saxlingham Thorpe-with-Saxlingham Nethergate, Norfolk.
Pownall, Rev. Reginald E.. Curate of Rothwell; Rector of St. Paul's, Stanningley, Leeds.
Ramsey, Rev. Henry Havelock, M.A., Fellow of St. Augustine's College, Canterbury; Vice-Principal of Wells Theological College.
Radcliffe, Rev. C. E. S,, M.A., Vicar of Bickenhill; Honorary Secretary A.C.S. for the Deanery of Coleshill.
Redfern, Rev. T., M.A., Vicar of Holy Trinity, Oswestry; Surrogate for the Diocese of St. Asaph.
Ricketts, Rev. Richard Ernest, M.A.; Curate-in-Charge (temporary) of Middleton-on-the-Wolds.
Rowe, Rev. Valentine Francis; Vicar of Framsden, Suffolk.
Rundell, Rev. E. W. M. C., M.A., Curate of Lyddington, near Uppingham; Rector of Wakerley, Stamford.
Scott, Rev. Joseph John, M.A., Rector of St. Clements, Ordsal, Salford; Honorary Canon of Manchester Cathedral.
Sims, Rev. Frederick A., M.A.; Chaplain and Naval Instructor to the *Collingwood*.
Sing, Rev. G. H., M.A., Vicar of St. John's, Derby; Honorary Canon of Southwell Cathedral.
Stanton, Rev. Professor V. H., D.D., Canon of Ely; Warden of the Ely Diocesan Society of Mission Clergy.
Steele, Rev. Charles, Vicar of Levenheath, near Bures, Suffolk.
Stratten, Rev. J. R., M.A., Vicar of St. Paul's, Leeds; Honorary Canon of Ripon Cathedral.
Streeten, Rev. H. R. B. Septimus, M.A., Missions to Seamen Chaplain for North Sea Fishermen at Yarmouth; Vicar of St. James's, Halifax.
Thomas, Rev. Francis Edward, M.A.; Rector of Chorlton-with-Hardy, Manchester.
Thomas, Rev. J. W.; Vicar of Seagry, Wilts.
Varley, Rev. John, Senior Curate of Shirley, Southampton; Vicar of St. Julian's, Shrewsbury.
Ward, Rev. George; Rural Dean of Bolingbroke.
Watson, Rev. W. S.; Head Master of the Dorset County School.
Wharton, Rev. George Henry Lawrence, Curate of St. Aidan's, Leeds; Vicar of Gilling, Yorkshire.
Whinerey, Rev. Robert, M.A.; Vicar of Tuddenham, St. Martin, Suffolk.
Woode, Rev. E., M.A.; Rector of Mepal, Ely.

CLERICAL OBITUARY.

Cotes, Rev. Septimus, for forty-seven years Rector of the parish, at Newington Rectory, Oxford, on the 11th inst., aged 82.
Gristock, Rev. Alfred Grabham, Vicar of St. John's, Upper Holloway, at 10, St. John's-park, Upper Holloway, on the 2nd inst., aged 42.
Holditch, Rev. John Henry, for thirty-one years Rector of Bulwick, at Stibbington House, Wansford, on the 13th inst., aged 82.
Marriott, Rev. Charles Harwick, Vicar of Walton-with-Felixstow, at Walton Vicarage, Ipswich, on the 11th inst., ged 78.
Saxton, Rev. Charles Somes, M.A., Rector of Beechamwell, Norfolk, at the Rectory, on the 14th inst., aged 44.
Sharp, Rev. William, Rector of the parish, J.P. for Cumberland, and late Vicar of Addingham, at Mareham Rectory, on the 12th inst., aged 80.
Trollope, Rev. John Joseph, M.A., Vicar of Lydney and Prebendary of Hereford Cathedral, at Lydney Vicarage, on the 8th inst., aged 75.

FIRST REMOVE THE CAUSE.

MEN frequently worry and trouble themselves a great deal in trying to cure the symptoms of vital weakness, nervous exhaustion, and kindred ailments, instead of endeavouring to first remove the cause. This can be done by Mr. Harness' Electropathic Treatment without the aid of drugs. It is useless to tell sufferers to employ their minds and bodies in useful work and to forget their disorders, so long as the cause of their troubles is not removed. How can it be expected that when they are fatigued by the least exertion they can occupy themselves by studying, walking, or other exercise? Even in conversation they frequently lose the thread of it and repeatedly find their memory failing them. What can they do? Physic will not cure them—perhaps the leading physicians have fallen to afford them any relief, and they have consequently become hopeless. It is to such as these that Mr. Harness' new combined Electropathic Belt and Suspensory is so strongly recommended, as, by its gentle but continuous action, invigorating electric currents are imperceptibly generated and conveyed direct from the spinal cord to the affected parts. It is this scientifically constructed and convenient appliance which silently but surely acts upon the vital organs, and removes the cause of the patient's disease, effecting a wonderful change in his health, character, and conduct, and speedily enabling him to return to his natural tastes and habits, and enjoy once more the full vigour of youth, with all its accompanying pleasures.

We may add that this perfect Electro-medical appliance is exceedingly comfortable to wear, gives wonderful support and vitality to all the internal organs of the body, prevents chills, imparts new life and vigour to the debilitated constitution, stimulates the organic action, promotes the circulation, assists digestion, and promptly renews that vital energy, the loss of which is the first symptom of decay. Its healing properties are multifarious. It stimulates the functions of various organs, increases their secretions, gives tone to muscle and nerves, relaxes morbid contractions, improves nutrition, and effectually renews exhausted nerve force. Acting directly on the system, it sustains and assists its various functions, and thus promotes the health and vigour of the entire frame. Besides these benefits, the mind is maintained in a buoyant, cheerful state, and every faculty is stimulated to the highest condition of intellectual strength.

Gentlemen who read the above announcement have only to visit London and call at the Electropathic and Zander Institute (52, Oxford Street, W.) to be convinced of the marvellous curative powers of Electricity and Mr. Harness' perfect methods of imperceptibly applying the current. The medical officers of the establishment are in daily attendance, and may by consulted free of charge either personally or by letter.

The Church of England Pulpit.

THE CONDITIONS OF DIVINE PROGRESS.

By the Rev. A. PLUMMER, D.D., Master of University College, Durham.

Sermon preached in Durham Cathedral on the Fourth Sunday in Advent, 1892, at the Ordination of the Lord Bishop of Durham.

"I have yet many things to say unto you, but ye cannot bear them now."—St. John xvi. 12.

THERE are two portions of the New Testament to which one who holds office in Christ's Church naturally goes for special guidance in the difficult work of the ministry. One of them is the pastoral epistles of St. Paul; the other is those farewell discourses to the disciples which our Lord delivered a few hours before He surrendered Himself to His enemies. In the one the Apostle of the Gentiles teaches his two chief disciples and delegates, and through them Christian ministers throughout all ages, on what principles they are to act as overseers of the flock in a variety of circumstances. In the other, the Master Himself instructs His Apostles, and through them all Christendom, by teaching them how and what to teach; and, while He instructs, He invests with authority and power; the power to understand better what He has already shown to them; the power to receive what He has not yet shown to them; and the authority to pass it on to others with ceaselessly expanding productiveness and adaptability. For what they pass on is not their own, but the whole truth of Christ in all its inexhaustible details, as they are revealed to the churches, through the experience of Christians, and by the perpetual illumination of the Holy Spirit. The words of the text, as we might expect from their import, come near the close of these farewell discourses. Soon after they were spoken Jesus ceased to address the Apostles, and began His high-priestly prayer to His Heavenly Father, for Himself, for His disciples, and for all of us who have been enabled to believe on Him through their word.

"I have yet many things to say unto you, but ye cannot bear them now." When we look back upon any last interview that we have had with one or more, even where we knew beforehand that it would be a last interview, and that the opportunity of speaking face to face would never return in this world, how much is found to have been left unsaid! Things that we ought to have said, meant to have said, and yet after all did not say, either because there was no time for such words, or because the words would not come. It would be a grave mistake to explain this utterance of Jesus Christ by any such commonplace considerations. He knew to the moment how much time was at His disposal for these last words, and how much time was necessary in order that everything that could with profit be said might be said in the best way. Nothing was hurried, nothing was forgotten. No human emotion was allowed to interfere with these gentle, but indelible strokes, which put the finishing touch to the work of a Saviour who had not yet died and risen again. Whatever was omitted was deliberately omitted, because the time for saying it had not yet come. He had told the faithful eleven that they are His friends, and that He gives them the whole of a friend's confidence without stint or reservation. But it would be useless to tell them at once what they could not at present understand. It would be cruel to communicate truths which now would only crush them. When conditions are present—and they will come—in which they can hear without perplexity or dismay, they will be led, by a Guide that cannot err, into the new and boundless territory of the truth "that passeth knowledge."

"But ye cannot bear them now." Perhaps there is no other passage in the whole of these marvellous discourses in which Jesus Christ appears more conspicuously as the great Educator of His ministers, as the Shepherd of shepherds, revealing to them in tender consideration the principle on which He deals with them, and will deal with them, and the principle on which they must be ready to carry on His work in their own hearts and in the hearts of others. On this night of the Last Supper He has said things which He would not have said at the marriage feast in Cana, nor at the feeding of the five thousand on the heights above the lake; and there are yet many things which He will not say even now. And the principle throughout is the same. He withholds, not because He lacks the desire to communicate, not because He wills to reserve *meum secretum mihi*, but because as yet these things cannot be told with profit, cannot be told without loss to the cause of truth and damage to those who hear prematurely.

It was no new principle. We can trace it in God's dealings with the human race, and especially with the chosen people, throughout the whole of the Old Testament. To each age, to each nation, to each form of civilisation and religion, as their typical characteristics are brought out and placed before us in these lifelike descriptions by known and unknown writers and selectors, we can hear the Divine maxim being whispered in all its fatherly tenderness, "I have yet many things to say unto you, but ye cannot bear them now." Does it perplex us that even among those who knew most about God so much debasement and ignorance was

tolerated, so many saving truths which to us seem quite obvious in science, in morality, and in religion, were withheld? Let us rest assured that it was in no niggardly, grudging spirit that the human race was kept for generations from the fruition of these ennobling gifts, but because to mankind, at that early stage of progress, such gifts would not have been ennobling. Throughout the Bible, and throughout all human history, there are silences which to those who contemplate them aright are as instructive as the utterances which they separate and throw into relief. In the whole process of revelation, the God who reveals is also a God who hides Himself; and it is thus that a domain is provided in which the believer can test the strength of his own confidence in God. "Though He slay me," and slay me in the dark, "yet will I trust in Him."

"I have yet many things to say unto you, but ye cannot bear them now." You will hardly need to be reminded that this was the principle upon which the Apostles acted in dealing with their converts. St. Paul writes to the factious Corinthians, who by their conduct had proved themselves to be still "babes in Christ," "I fed you with milk, not with meat; for ye were not yet able to bear it, nay, not even now are ye able; for ye are yet carnal" (1 Cor. iii. 2, 3)—words which are little more than a paraphrase of the very words which we are now considering. And in a still sadder tone the author of the Epistle to the Hebrews writes to them that he has much to say respecting Christ, but they "are become dull of hearing. For when by reason of the time ye ought to be teachers, ye have need again that some one teach you the rudiments of the first principles of the oracles of God; and are become such as have need of milk, and not of solid food" (Heb. v. 11, 12). The Corinthians, even more than the Apostles on the eve of the Passion, were still in the infancy of the spiritual life. The Hebrews were far worse; they had not merely failed to make reasonable progress; they had by their neglect gone back to childishness; and, at a time when they ought to have been instructing others, they had the very alphabet of Christianity to learn again themselves. But in all these cases, which are but specimens of a common state of things, unwelcome facts cannot be remedied by ignoring them. If those with whom the teacher has to deal are only at the stage of childhood, it is worse than useless to treat them as adults, and give them food which, however excellent in itself, will be no food to them.

Do you need to be reminded that this merciful principle, of which God is constantly giving us illustrations in His dealings with mankind, which Christ has formulated for us, and which His Apostles have reiterated when speaking in His Name, is one which everyone is bound to keep carefully before him, when he accepts the responsible office of instructing others in the faith, and "guiding their feet into the way of peace?" If these few words which I am desired to address to you this morning have the effect of impressing this great truth a little more strongly upon the minds of some, they will not have been altogether thrown away. The evils which are "wrought by want of thought" are among the most tragic things in human life, not merely because nearly all of them might, without great difficulty, have been prevented, but because so many of them are produced with the very best intentions. Men wish to do good, and purpose to do good; and then, through insufficient consideration of the circumstances, they say or do exactly the wrong thing, which they might have known to be the wrong thing, if they had but remembered the kind of persons with whom they were dealing. This is a form of evil to which we all of us contribute largely; but probably the largest contributors are generally the impulsive and the enthusiastic, and this for the most part means the inexperienced and the young. It is a form of evil against which we need to be specially on our guard at the present time, when exaggeration and over-statement are part of the stock-in-trade of a very large number of those who endeavour to get the ear of the public. Men deliberately say a great deal more than they mean, in the expectation that they will thereby induce some of their audience to accept half of what they say. They fling out startling paradoxes, or state what is unquestionably true in a way calculated to shock and offend, in order (as they say) "to rouse the public conscience." Is it not manifest that, while some may thus possibly be led to recognise the element of truth which underlies this reckless talk, many more recognise nothing but the recklessness, and thus are alienated from the truth, perhaps for ever? Far less harm is done by offering to the uninstructed less of the truth than they might have accepted, than by forcing upon them a great deal more than they are at present at all likely to welcome.

It is an error of the same kind, when we have gained a hold upon those whom we desire to influence for their welfare, to try to hurry them on too fast. We live in an impatient age, and most of us give way to the temptation of trying to compress what of necessity must be a long and anxious process into a moderate compass of time. Evils which have been the growth of centuries cannot be undone in a generation; and a life which is to last throughout eternity cannot be brought to perfection in a year. But we are so impressed with the many things that there is need to say, that we forget to ask the question whether men can bear them now. We are so full of the immeasurable distance which separates the highest Christian attainment of our time from the depth of degradation in which the masses lie, and even from the low level of moral inefficiency at which multitudes of professing Christians are content to remain, that we are slow to recognise the fact that this great distance has been in a large measure created and

made permanent by the faulty, hasty, and even harsh methods which have been adopted for raising those who lie so low. It was with the instincts of a true shepherd that Jacob pleaded with his impulsive brother, "If they overdrive them one day, all the flocks will die" (Gen. xxxiii. 13). And it is of the Divine Shepherd that it is written that "He will gently lead those that are with young." You will have to deal with heated brains, teeming with crude conceptions; with heaving breasts, panting with half-formed aspirations; with throbbing hearts, bursting with just and unjust indignations. Be content to lead gently, not to enjoin or expect too much, not to be hard upon defects or excesses. A light hand will be welcomed where a heavy hand would be dashed aside.

"I have yet many things to say unto you, but ye cannot bear them now." In conclusion, let us remember that this is the principle on which Christ is always dealing with each one of ourselves. At each stage of our spiritual progress He has always more things to reveal to us than we can at that moment bear. They are waiting for us, to be given with a bounteous hand, as soon as we are ready to receive them. It may be that during these last few weeks, or these last few solemn days, Christ has come to you in ways that you could not have understood and could not have welcomed a year or two ago. Pentecost did not complete this promised illumination for the Apostles, and your ordination will not close it for you. Remember that it is no less than "all the truth" into which He has promised that the Paraclete shall guide you; and that, therefore, there are no limits to the revelations of the Divine will which loyal, willing hearts may win. These revelations are made "by divers portions and in divers manners," not seldom by suffering. At times we may feel tempted to meet them with the cry, "This is a hard saying; who can hear it?" But let us hold fast to the gracious assurance that at no moment will more be told to us than we are able to bear. And then our natural reluctance will give place to the loyal prayer, "Speak, Lord, for Thy servant heareth."

THE DOCTRINE OF ANGELS.

By the Rev. W. PAGE ROBERTS, M.A., Rector of St. Peter's, Vere Street, W.

Sermon Preached in St. Peter's Church, on Sunday, February 21st, 1892.

"Thy will be done, as in heaven, so on earth."—St. Matt. vi. 10.

THE Lord's Prayer in two sentences declares nearly all that we can with any confidence affirm about heaven. It tells that in some way beyond our comprehension heaven is the dwelling-place of God: "Our Father, which art in heaven." We can scarcely localise that beauteous life diffused unseen throughout eternal space, and yet we know that that which is everywhere is nearer to some than it is to others. Some even in this life are so near to God that their souls can say, "O God, Thou art my God." And the Lord's Prayer tells us that heaven contains agents acting in subordination to the will of God, whose service is of so fine a nature that they may be taken by man as his ideal, up to which he must aspire in prayer: "Thy will be done, as in heaven, so on earth."

By what steps have these thoughts of heaven and angels been reached? Have these thoughts been superseded by later ones? Must we be content to hold them as final, or must the vision of angelic beings dissolve in the cold light of reason, like Urania and Puck and the elfin bands that used to ply their unseen witcheries on mortal men? Philosophy will clip an angel's wings, conquer mysteries by rule and line, empty the haunted air of nomad bands. Permit me, then, this morning, to retrace the steps by which we have reached our present thoughts of angels and heaven.

To begin with, all rude people look upon the sky as a solid roof in which the stars, and moon, and sun are fastened. From the regions above this sky-roof come rain, and hail, and snow. This was the belief among the early Hebrews, and it has been preserved in their ancient traditions. We read last Sunday morning of the firmament which divided the waters above the firmament from the waters which were below the firmament; and we read about the windows of heaven being opened to let down the flood. One rabbinical story tells how that two stars were taken out of the solid firmament above the earth in order to get openings big enough for the descent of the deluge.

But one of man's earliest gods was the great heaven. It was a god to the Semite, as it was to our Aryan ancestors. Who can be surprised that the sun was a primitive object of worship? It is, I confess, surprising that when the Temple was built and its services established, and up to the time of the Captivity—it is surprising that sun-worship was practised by the Israelites all that time, and that together, side by side with the worship of Jehovah, the worship of the sun was practised. But what more natural than that the desert nomad should worship the sun? How could he help it? When he lifted up his eyes in the early morning from the ground on which he had been sleeping, or crept from under his dull, dingy tent into the dull dawn, and saw, ascending from the horizon to the topmost sky, the great red sun advancing like a resistless monarch, no wonder he bowed his head before the increasing splendour! And the moon and the stars, they were wonderful beings, but the heaven was more wonderful still. Sun, and moon, and stars were only like its children. It held them all, and could hold thousands more, in the hollow of its hand. They went away, but it never did.

They might be killed when they were away, and not come back again at all; but the great heaven was always present, often terrible, hurling its fiery javelins, consuming rock, and tree, and beast, and man, and shaking the earth with its angry voice.

Probably the stormy, threatening heaven was one of the earliest objects of worship with Turanian, Semite, and Aryan. Some students of religion consider that the Jehovah of the Jews had in their early days been a sky-god, a god of the heavens; that in their savage state the Beni-Israel worshipped the sky in the name of Jehovah, or Yahveh; and they say that the poetical language of the Bible bears trace of such primitive worship of heaven, just as we know that the sun was worshipped until a comparatively late period of their history. For, remember, the poetry of one age has often been the prose of the previous age. When the Hebrew said this, "The God of Jeshurun rideth upon the heavens," and when he sang, "He rode upon the cherubims and did fly," and when he said again, "He maketh the clouds His chariot, and walketh upon the wings of the wind," these expressions may have become purely metaphorical; but it is thought by some *savants* that these verses once were uttered as eternal truth, that in the Semitic dwelling-places Jehovah was the god of the stormy heaven, and one of their earliest objects of worship, as Indra was to those whose faith is represented by the Vedas. Gradually, however, men looked upon the heaven and the sun and other physical objects as only the clothing, the outward sign and body, as it were, of a God who dwelt inside them as the living soul. As the Greek recognised a Divine presence in the graven image which was yet distinct from it, and as certain Christians recognise a divine presence in certain consecrated material things, so the heaven was supposed to contain a real Divine presence, as it were, distinct from it, just like our soul is within us and animates our body, and yet is distinct from it. Then they separated still more widely, and the heaven became as distinct from the thing as the man is distinct from the house in which he lives. And then there was a god of the earth, and a god of the heaven, and a god of the sea; and heaven became the palace, the presence-chamber, of God, and the powers of nature were His ministers, and the spirits of nature became angels, who, like courtiers and officers of state, surrounded the Monarch and stood ready to speed at once on His commands.

But the latest development of the doctrine of heaven—namely, as the abode of good men departed this life—did not clearly emerge during Old Testament days. The nearest approach to such an idea is in the book of Daniel, which is a very late book, written not such a very long time before the coming of Christ. The thought of good people going to heaven when they die would have been as unfamiliar to a Jew as it would have been to an Athenian to think that good Greeks went to Olympus when they died. Pfleiderer speaks of the un-Jewish hope of another world in heaven. Faith in a rich and radiant immortality had no existence through the greater part of Old Testament days, and therefore such words as those precious words of Christ, "In My Father's house are many mansions; I go to prepare a place for you"—such words as those could not have been spoken even by the greatest of the Jewish prophets.

Now what did Christ mean when He said or suggested that God's will was done in an ideal and perfect way in heaven? I think He must have had present to His mind the service of the angel ministrants of God. We know that when Christ lived the doctrine of angels had become large and definite. I hope to-day you will not be tired if, as I trace the doctrine of heaven from elementary nature-worship, I present you with a very brief sketch of the belief in angels. Do not, I pray, let any of my rationalistic friends regard such a subject as a kind of *furor poeticus*, as Shelley's "Skylark," and as ideal, or as the latest born and loveliest vision of Olympus' faded hierarchy. The existence of angels is as much in accordance with the forecasts of science as it is congenial to the poetry and the dreams of man. There is nothing to stagger the most exact mind in the thought that there are beings in this universe higher and more powerful than man. Science has discovered in the heavenly bodies, many of which are inconceivably larger than that which we inhabit, substances identical with those that surround us. If our globe has produced life, it is not irrational to suppose that they may produce life, and if life has here attained to mind, it is not impossible that there also it may have reached the same altitude. Why should we think that the human mind, and its flower, the flower of moral excellence—why should we think it cannot be surpassed? Why, we ourselves dream of intelligence not our own and goodness never reached by us. If the worlds of the great heaven, in structure like our own, are vaster, why may they not have inhabitants superior to us in intelligence, in virtue, and in beauty? At least it is not for evolution to shrug its shoulders at an angelic world and ever-ascending hierarchies, principalities, and powers. It may not seem to be of much consequence to us whether there are angels or not, any more than whether there is sodium in Saturn; but there is nothing irrational in imagining or in believing that in greater realms than ours mind may have reached to finer development.

The belief in angels passed over directly from Judaism to Christianity. Christianity, I may say, created the doctrine of heaven as the abode of holy men and women departed; it simply received the doctrine of angels. It is after the close of the Old Testament canon that the doctrine of angels reached its highest development, and in this form it passed into Christianity, as did also a developed doctrine of demonology. Belief in angels is more charac-

teristic of Christianity than it is of any other religion in the world, but it is less prominent in the Old Testament than it is in the New. The word "angel" occurs more frequently in the single book of the Revelation than it does in the whole of the Old Testament put together; and it is much more frequent, as you will notice, in the later books of the Old Testament than in the earlier, as, for instance, in Zechariah, Daniel, and Malachi, whose very name, I believe, means "angel," or "messenger." And this must be remembered by careful students of the Bible, because these prophets wrote after the Babylonian captivity; and it was when Persian beliefs on some subjects had been appropriated by the Judæans that the more frequent and definite references to angels occurred.

But we should be in error if we imagined that the Jews took their belief about angels altogether from Persia. They had, to start with, certain crude notions about angels. In Genesis vi. we are told that the angels of God, or the sons of God, married the daughters of men, from whom sprang a race of heroes. Dr. Robertson Smith intimates that this story is not at all natural to Hebraic modes of thought, and he says this legend must have been taken over from a lower faith. Angels are represented in the Old Testament as talking, and wrestling, and brandishing swords, and eating, and there is a strange verse on which a great deal of folly has been written: "So man did eat angels' food." Sometimes an angel is called in the Bible a man. It says there was a man wrestled with Jacob, and Mr. Maurice says that nowhere in Scripture is an angel represented as of any other essence or even of another form than man. Now it happens sometimes—I say it with all modesty—it happens sometimes with the writings of my illustrious predecessor in this pulpit, ordinary men find it hard to say positively what they mean. They are not always certain whether a thing is affirmed or denied, or both affirmed and denied; and "reason fades in the dim twilight of Plutonic shades." If Mr. Maurice means that wherever we have in the Bible an angel presented as only a man or a mere messenger, or whether he means it is always a celestial being, but that the nature and form of this celestial being are human, I am quite unable to decide. This is my perplexity: if the angel is celestial, I do not know what authority there is for saying that in his essence and form he is only a man, for if it is so, how did the person who saw a celestial angel know that it was anything else but a man? Those who in times past were personally introduced to ghosts generally knew they were ghosts. I may say, if I am allowed it, they saw through them. But a ghost whose essence and form were those of a man would most probably be regarded as a burglar if he were discovered in one of our houses, and as speedily as possible handed over to the police.

I think that very often, when some startling event took place which men recognised as something they could not understand, and therefore as the operation of God, they personated the action, and said it was done by an angel. The winds of heaven are called God's angels, and pestilences are called God's angels, His evil angels, as when it is said of the plagues of Egypt, He sent evil angels among them. It does not mean devils. The Jews did not know anything about devils in that day. They said in those days, "If there is evil in the city, hath not the Lord done it?" The Persian creed intermingled with the old Hebrew belief. For let us remember that no one nation, in the providence of God, has ever been sufficient in itself to form a perfect religion. The final religion is the synthesis of the different Divine elements in all religions, and in our Christianity to-day you and I have contributions from the Persian Avesta. The Babylonian captivity and the subsequent friendship of the Persians and the Jews—you remember Cyrus is called by the prophet the servant of Jehovah, although he never forsook his own religion, which we should call a heathen one—I say the Babylonian captivity and the subsequent friendship of the Babylonians and the Jews had their place, in the providence of God, in the development of a religious belief. The angels of different countries, like Michael and Gabriel, and, in the book of Tobit, Raphael, as well as the mysterious Azazel, may have been adopted from Zoroastrian sources. As for the fall of the angels, we can say nothing whatever about it. The reference to it in the book of Jude cannot justify an elaborate creed like that which Milton has established in our minds. Who can understand the verse in the leaflet we call Jude which says, "Michael disputed with the devil about the body of Moses"? Absolutely unintelligible! The book of Jude was long before it established its place in the canon, and in the present day its right is denied by weighty scholars.

And now in Christianity the doctrine of angels has been raised into a purely spiritual atmosphere. Angels are "ministering spirits, sent forth to minister to them who shall be heirs of salvation." If to-day belief in angels has but little influence upon human life—and it matters not, if God be with us, who is our guardian and guide, whether an unseen spirit from His presence is about us, or His own Holy Spirit is within us, it matters not, if God be with us, how He comes—nevertheless the belief in angels has secured for itself a pre-eminent place in Christian poetry and painting. Impossible as are the beings with feathery wings, or the bodiless cherubs whose sweet faces look out upon us from the great Italian masters, who could fail to feel the spiritual beauty of Browning's "Guardian Angel," even if he had not seen Guercino's picture at Verona? I say we should be poorer men and women if we lost the idea of these beautiful beings. We mean by an angel, it may be without distinctly saying it to ourselves—we mean by it goodness, and purity, and burning devotion raised up into

consummate beauty. You say it is only an idea, but is not it a good idea? is not it a great idea? is not it an inspired idea? In this world we do see goodness, and purity, and devotion, and beauty, but we do not see them united in one perfect being. We do not see any perfect beings. With us moral excellence is often allied with an imperfect temper, with a feeble intelligence, with bodily weakness, with vanity; and deep devotion may dwell in a narrow mind; and beauty may bewitch us with its eyes, and they, too, may have a gleam of the fiend behind them; and the heroes of the world may bear on their faces the scars of conflict, the pallor of exhaustion, the deep lines of labour which never has attained its object. Man is not satisfied with the present unless he is like a cow or a pig. Man dreams of a better world, of goodness which is all beauty, of religion strong in soaring intelligence, as if it had an angel's wing. The Hebrew word "seraph" is derived from a root signifying "love," and the Hebrew word "cherub" is derived from a Hebrew root signifying "to know." And when love and knowledge, now so often divided—when they are united, love and knowledge, we have a perfect ideal, a thought of God, God's angel. An angel is perfect goodness, expressed by perfect beauty, and led by loftiest mind. And if that is an angel, who dare shrug his shoulders at that? If we cannot believe in real presences in bread and wine and such things, thank God we can believe in the real presence in these minds of ours; we can believe that there can be there wise and beautiful goodness. What can ennoble the breast of maid, and matron, and man like the vision of an unspotted soul, clothed around in moral beauty?

And now we may understand why the great artists and holy ones of the world delighted in angels. What a soul must have been to Fra Angelico, painter and saint; It was the guardian angel of goodness which carried him to the skies and opened the heavens to his adoring genius. An angel means this—and it is something to take home for us, if the rest is forgotten—an angel means the beauty of holiness, the beauty of holiness.

And now with your reason as well as with your spirit you may pray, "Thy will be done on earth as it is in heaven."

THE York Diocesan Calendar for 1893 states that that diocese now contains 626 benefices.

CHURCH OF ENGLAND SANITARY ASSOCIATION.—The Archdeacon of London presided last Tuesday in Manchester at a committee meeting of the Church of England Sanitary Association. It was resolved that in view of the possible return of cholera it was desirable that the clergy and ministers of religion generally, having special opportunities throughout the country, should call attention to the duty of everyone to concern himself in sanitary matters. It was also resolved to urge the formation of parochial branches, which would serve as vigilance sanitary committees.

NOTICES.

All communications respecting the Literary portion of the paper should be addressed to the Editor.

Business communications of every kind should be addressed to Mr. S. GIBBON, at the CHURCH OF ENGLAND PULPIT Office, 160, Fleet Street, London, E.C., to whom cheques and Post-office orders for subscriptions (in advance), three months, 2s., six months, 3s. 6d., twelve months, 6s. 6d., are to be made payable.

The Cases for binding Vol. XXXIV. are now ready.

FOR HEALTH AND IMMORTALITY.

The Ecclesiastical Review.

SATURDAY, JANUARY 28, 1893.

REVOLUTION, REVELATION.

THE release of James Egan, the convicted dynamiter, ought to have aroused deeper criticism than has appeared so far. The reason hinted at—to give them their due, not openly professed—by the supporters of the Government, is that there was reasonable doubt of his guilt. That is not true, and, if it were, would not be valid. Mr. Gladstone was in office when Egan was convicted, and for a year after; he has held a second term of office since; and it is not suggested that any new facts in Egan's case have been disclosed to Mr. Gladstone's Home Secretary in 1893 which were not familiar to Mr. Gladstone's Home Secretary, who allowed him to go to jail, in 1884, and left him there in 1885 and 1886.

The real reason for the convict's release is not to be found in his possible innocence, nor altogether, as most people suppose, in the pressure brought to bear upon Mr. Gladstone by his Irish allies. It is farther still to seek, and it raises a question about the responsible government of England. Are we governed by a Cabinet, or are we in the hands of one man, and that not the man ostensibly at the head of affairs?

It is certain that Mr. Gladstone is not personally responsible for the release of Egan. The Prime Minister is eighty-four; his strength is on the wane, he lives, officially, in imperious seclusion, and the preparation of his Home Rule Bill fills his thoughts. Details of government he leaves to others, according to the degree of confidence he has in them, and the release of Egan is a detail which would hardly claim his attention.

The members of the Government connected

with Home and Imperial affairs are not responsible, at least directly. They know too much about dynamite—notably Sir William Harcourt. Even the present Home Secretary is hardly likely to have volunteered such an act of clemency. To the sentimentalists Mr. Asquith has been a grievous disappointment.

The person really responsible is Mr. Morley. The direction of Irish affairs has been entrusted entirely to him, and he has the whip-hand of the Cabinet. Possessing completely the confidence of Mr. Gladstone, he is able to impose his will upon his colleagues in all matters which he can bring within the range of his office. Since Ireland industriously blocks the way, Mr. Morley is enabled, with more or less ease, to obtain anything which he represents as indispensable to Irish administration. To the rest of the Cabinet resistance means resignation. They are dumb dogs, with Mr. Morley for kennel-man.

This is a new phase of "Castle government" with a vengeance. It is a serious affair to have political departments virtually controlled by men other than those nominally responsible. But the principle of the control is even worse than the fact.

Mr. Morley is misunderstood as a politician, owing to his failure as a philosopher. His books never were popular or widely read. He lifted up his voice in a wilderness—nay, in a complete desert—as far as the public was concerned. As a journalist he was, of course, anonymous. And so he has slipped into politics as the unknown force, which could not be calculated upon. To do him justice, this was not his fault. He is a man of ardent, of passionate convictions (not the least the cool, impassive person he is often imagined to be); he is imaginative, enthusiastic, even fanatical; we need not add, resolute to the point of obstinacy. He cannot be made to budge an inch from what he considers his principles, and he has never lost an opportunity of proclaiming them. If they are not known, that is the fault partly of the principles and partly of the books which contain them—perhaps we ought to say, enshrine them.

And it is in the consistent practice of his principles that Mr. Morley has procured the release of Egan; he will probably try to procure the release of Daly and Gallagher; so he would have befriended Ravachol, or any other Anarchist conspirator who has sinned and suffered in our generation. He might possibly regret their methods, but he would applaud their motives. For Mr. Morley is a Revolutionist, his sympathies are with Revolutionists, his system is government by Revolution. To him Revolution is Revelation; it is, in his own words, "a new Gospel." He has transformed it into a religion, and throughout his works he delights to adorn his new faith with the sacred expressions of the old. This may seem a strong statement, but the student of his works will know that the practice is systematically followed throughout them, as a few more quotations will prove.

Rousseau and Diderot he calls "Fathers of the new Church"; Condorcet, Mirabeau, Robespierre, are "fiery apostles." Robespierre is a "great Preacher"; the Encyclopædists are "a new order" "bound by new vows, happily destined to replace the Society of Jesus." The Church, its creeds and its book, stand to the "best men" of the eighteenth century as the Pagan idols stood to those of the first. Diderot and his school are "a new priesthood." Voltaire is compared to St. Peter and to Christ. In fact Mr. Morley has a speciality of style, a blasphemous slang, in which he displays his intimate acquaintance with Christian documents by a studious appropriation of their most honourable and reverential phrases.

All this he does not shrink from carrying to its logical conclusions. All that is opposed to the teaching of these "great preachers," "fiery apostles," and "new priests" comes in for condemnation. Hence we read in Mr. Morley's books, of "the Mediæval superstition about purity," and that Diderot, than whom perhaps no man was filthier in life and conversation, "was keenly alive to the beauty of order and domestic piety." Hence also references to "that mean and poor form of domesticity which has always been too apt to fascinate the English imagination," and to "domestic sentimentality of a greasy kind." Mr. Morley adds the information that "Byron helped to clear the air of this." Helped! To copy his own style, Mr. Morley is the evangelist of Revolution of the type of the Reign of Terror, of a revelation which boasts Voltaire, Diderot, and Rousseau for its apostles, and Marat and Robespierre for its priests, and denounces the Christian Bible and the Christian creed and code as mischievous Pagan idols. In this new hierarchy of Mr. Morley's James Egan will naturally find a niche, at least as temple-sweeper or humble acolyte, with a possibility of better things to come. He has not yet attained to the strength of the odour of sanctity achieved by the filth of Diderot, or the bloodstained licentiousness of Robespierre and Marat, but his motives are all right and his faith is sound, only opportunity was lacking, which opportunity will now come.

What more reason is to seek for Mr. Morley's release of such a man? To do this sinister evangelist full justice, we will say at once he is not likely to be coerced by all the American-Irish in the world. Mr. Healy and Mr. Redmond might have whistled for their friend's release if Mr. Morley had not been convinced of what a wrong-headed public imagined to be Egan's guiltiness, but which is really in Mr. Morley's eyes his virtue. The Cabinet seem to have made up their minds to sit at Mr. Morley's feet in these matters. We can hardly believe, however, that the great body of Englishmen are as yet prepared frankly to accept Mr. Morley's gospel of Revolution as Revelation.

THE NEW INFERNO.

When poor Ernest Renan was generally known to be approaching the end of his career, he received anonymous letters and post-cards from unknown persons who seemed to take a deep interest in his future destiny, one of which contained only these words, *Il y a un enfer*. His remark upon this cheerful piece of information was, that he very much wished there was a hell, for he was very sure that, if he found himself there, he would discover some way out of it, and that, at any rate, continued existence was preferable to extinction, which was the thing that he dreaded. What a pleasure has the great sceptic missed by dying a few months too soon to read, in the *Nineteenth Century* for December, Mr. Mivart's article, in which he assures us that hell is a very happy place, much superior in that respect to earth, and that its inhabitants are capable of indefinite improvement through the operation of the natural law of evolution, and may expect to enjoy meanwhile the pleasures of agreeable and profitable society.

We think it best to commence our article by quoting that glowing description of infernal happiness which is Mr. Mivart's conclusion:

> Hell in the widest sense — namely as including all those blameless souls who do not enjoy the Beatific Vision—may be considered as, for them, an abode of happiness transcending all our most vivid anticipations, so that man's natural capacity for happiness is there gratified to the very utmost; nor is it even possible for the Catholic theologian of the most severe and rigid school to deny that, thus considered, there is, and there will for all eternity be, a real and true *happiness in hell*.

We will add to this another sentence of the learned professor, which depicts vividly the society that may be cultivated and enjoyed in hell:

> Let us imagine a man in perfect health of mind and body, intelligent, amiable and wealthy, enjoying the universal esteem of all who know him, the devoted affection of his family, the peace of a good conscience, and the happiness of a natural love of and union with God. Let us further suppose that all his wishes are gratified, and that he has a full and certain knowledge that this great felicity will exist unimpaired, and be unceasingly enjoyed by him for all eternity, yet such a being will be in hell. Such at least (according to Catholic teaching), will be the lot of the immense multitude of mankind who, from before the formation of the earliest flint implement to the present day, have died unbaptised, and free from deliberate mortal sin, understood to be such.

Thus there would be for a man like Ernest Renan plenty of that society which he so much enjoyed. Socrates, Plato, Epictetus—above all his dear Marcus Aurelius would certainly be there: and he might wander about the regions of the new world, like Dante, with Virgil for a *cicerone*.

But then a difficulty would certainly present itself which to a man of his affectionate nature would be very painful, and which Mr. Mivart in his article passes entirely without notice. He would much miss his Parisian friends, and could not make himself happy if he had to resign himself to the thought that they were parted from him for ever. Where then would they be? To determine their place of residence in the other world, several circumstances would have to be considered, according to Catholic principles. First, their Baptism. All of them would probably have received this sacrament in infancy, and thus have been brought into a state of grace. All, with a few exceptions, would after baptism have some time or other in their lives, committed mortal sin. Of these, some, like Renan himself, must have died without being restored to a state of grace by the Sacrament of Penance, and would therefore be placed in hell; while the great majority would have made their peace with the Church, at least in their last moments, in which case their destination would be not hell but purgatory: which latter place is, according to Catholic doctrine, not a preparation for happiness in hell, but for the beatific vision itself, which beings in purgatory reach at last, though after a long probation. Thus poor Renan would find himself parted finally from the greater part of his society, and, with all his love for Pagan heroes, Plato and Marcus would hardly compensate him for the absence of his brilliant Parisian circle, and still less for that of mother and sister, wife and children.

It is a great defect in Mr. Mivart's article that he leaves purgatory entirely out of sight, and makes no allusion whatever to the necessary separations which must, according to Catholic doctrine, be produced by the operation of the Sacrament of Penance.

We must now proceed to state in Mr. Mivart's terms, and also in those of the authoritative definitions of his Church, the older doctrine, with which he attempts to reconcile his novel views. He gives the following account of the teaching of Catholic divines:

> They taught plainly that there were in hell unspeakable torments (*pœna sensûs*) in addition to the state of loss—the *pœna damni*. This was the unanimous teaching of Saints and Fathers—especially homilists—such as St. Gregory the Great, St. Augustine, St. Thomas Aquinas, St. Bonaventure, and so many more that it would be useless to attempt to enumerate them here. There can be no question but that the Catholic Church is irrevocably committed to the doctrine, that not only are the damned damned for all eternity, but that their condition is least inadequately represented by images of the most extreme and varied torture.

This description of the torments of hell may perhaps be treated as only the opinion of leading divines, but the following which is extracted, not by Mr. Mivart but by ourselves, is authoritative, as it comes out of the catechism of the Council of Trent, which speaks thus of hell:

> "It is a most foul (*teterrimus*) and dark dungeon, where the souls of the damned are tortured with perpetual and inextinguishable fire together with the unclean spirits, which place is also called gehenna, the abyss, and, in its proper sense, *Infernum*. (Catechism Conc. Trid., Pt. I., Art. v., Sect. 5.)
>
> Theologians have called the second kind of pain *pœna sensûs*, because it is felt by the bodily senses, as in strokes and stripes, and other severer kind of punishments, among which it cannot be doubted that tortures of fire produce the greatest feeling of pain. (Cat. Conc. Trid., Pt. I., Art. vii., Sect. 10.)

Mr. Mivart should hardly have said, as he does, that his Church has no where defined "hell fire." The last quoted sentence at least declares it to be something material producing bodily pain, like the smart of actual fire. It is also to be noted that he has, without a word of *congé*, dismissed into exile the devils, who were the warders and executioners of the Catholic hell. He never once names them, yet we think it will prove that his Church is as inextricably committed to their existence and personality, as to the existence of that most foul and dark prison, over which she has always taught that they preside.

It will now be easily seen that the task which Mr. Mivart has set himself, is one of immense difficulty. He has to show that this most foul and dark prison, in which a man must dwell for ever with the devils, is also a place in which he may enjoy the peace of a good conscience, and the happiness of a natural love of and union with God, in the company of blameless men, unceasingly for all eternity. And, in recommending

his Church to adopt his newly-formed opinion, he cannot tell her that her earlier view was a mistaken one, for such an admission would at once sacrifice her claim to infallibility. That fatal claim, erected by Pius IX. into a dogma, has, in this case as in many others, barred for the Roman Church all possibility of shaking off the erroneous opinions of darker ages.

However, Mr. Mivart gallantly faces his impossible task. The plan that he adopts is to introduce J. H. Newman's principle of *economy*. Newman's idea was that the objective facts of religion are, in themselves, quite beyond the reach of the present faculties of man, and therefore can only be conveyed to him by economies or adaptations suited to his present powers. These economies might be very dim adumbrations of the truth, or even positive untruths ; yet, nevertheless, the nearest approaches to truth that man could receive at the particular stage of enlightenment at which he had arrived at the time when they were given. Mr. Mivart cites two cases, in which he supposes this principle of economy to have been applied. One is the conception of hell as taught by nearly all the great authorities of Christendom ; the other the views prevailing among Christians respecting the Pagan religions and their adherents. With respect to the latter point, the universal belief of Christendom in early ages was that the heathen gods were devils, and their worship a service of devils. But now, when the world has learnt from history, that much of the belief, and still more of the ritual of the Christian Church has been inherited from those Pagan religions, an idea has been formed, which Mr. Mivart fully shares, that these also were divine manifestations, in a certain sense true and righteous, that their rites and ceremonies were in their measure good, and the worship of the heathen an acceptable service.

This close kinship with the Pagan religions is of course more keenly felt by a member of a church which still retains all the Pagan survivals that the half-converted heathen nations brought within its pale, than by a member of one of those churches, which has attempted, with more or less success, to return to the original Christianity of Christ ; but all thoughtful persons must feel that much of historical, and even of existent Christianity is merely a survival of Paganism. Such is the case with many of the current ideas about hell. We will venture to draw Mr. Mivart's attention to an example of this in his own article, of which we do not think he was himself aware. He quotes with approbation, as a proof that even the damned enjoy occasional holidays (*feriæ*), the following words out of an old Latin hymn :

> " Sunt et spiritibus sæpe nocentibus
> Poenarum celebres sub *Styge feriæ*
> Illâ nocte sacrâ quâ rediit Deus
> *Stagnis ad superos ex Acheronticis*. . . . .
> Marcent suppliciis *Tartara* mitibus,
> Exsultatque sui carceris otio
> *Umbrarum populus* liber ab *ignibus*,
> Nec fervent solito flumina *sulphure*.

Here is the whole scenery of the Pagan Tartarus with its very name—the *Stagna*, in which the black frogs used to live—the three rivers, Styx, Acheron, and, in the last line, Phlegethon, flaming sulphureous fumes ; and, in complete disregard of the dogma of the resurrection of the body, the inhabitants are a populace of shadows, and their visitant when he leaves hem, after their short respite, returns *ad superos*—to the gods above, just as Mercury might after performing an errand for Jupiter. The Latin poet who composed the hymn had not forgotten the Ovid, whom he learnt at school, from whose story of Orpheus and Eurydice comes the idea of a holiday in hell.

> Exsangues flebant animæ : nec Tantalus undam
> Captavit refugam : stupuitque Ixionis orbis :
> Nec carpsere jecur volueres : urnisque vacarunt
> Belides : inque tuo sedisti, Sisyphe, saxo.
> Tum primum lacrymis victarum carmine fama est
> Eumenidum maduisse genas.

The principle of economy, by the application of which Mr. Mivart attempts to justify the complete change of front which he is recommending to the authorities of his Church, on the two important points of her relation to the extra-Christian religions and her doctrine of future punishment, appears to us to be a compound of two distinct conceptions. One of these conceptions concerns the nature of all imaginable statements of divine things, that such statements never can express the actual facts, since these facts are beyond the reach of all human expression, but can only be approximations to them more or less remote, adumbrations of them more or less indistinct. The other conception relates to the receptivity of the persons to whom the statements are addressed, that these persons cannot form more than a vague idea of the facts which are the subjects of the statements, and therefore that a positive untruth may convey to them a truer idea of those facts than statements which are in themselves nearer to the truth.

Applying this principle to the two subjects with which he deals in his article, Mr. Mivart would have us think that the ancient Church doctrine, which held the Pagan religions to be the invention of devils, and the newer idea which he shares, that they are in their measure a dispensation of God, may, each in its turn, have been the nearest approximation to truth, that could have been stated at the periods when each prevailed, and the only ones which the people of each period could have accepted. Similarly the two contradictory statements, that hell is a place of excruciating torment, and that it is a place where unspeakable and eternal happiness may be enjoyed, were each in turn an approximation to truth, and the nearest approximation which could be received by the people of the periods when the statements were made.

This, we believe, is a correct exposition of the principle of economy, as held by Mr. Mivart and by Newman. But if the principle be a true one, its application cannot be confined to one or two points of doctrine, but must be extended over the whole fabric of dogma which the theologians of the Roman Church have built. It must be held that all dogmas are only economies — faint, inadequate, inexact, sometimes actually untruthful attempts to express inexpressible things, and to convey ideas of such things to people who have no faculties wherewith to form conceptions of them ; that they themselves are not the truth, but only the shadows of a truth which lies hid behind them. As such they must be liable to modification, or (as Mr. Mivart has shown in the two cases with which he has dealt) to complete change into their contradictories, whenever the expansion of the teacher's intellects suggests higher and wider views, or whenever the people to whom dogmas are addressed become receptive of clearer and juster ideas. The idea of a changeless teacher at the seat of Church authority, the dictum, *Quod semper, quod ab omnibus, quod ubique*, must be finally and for ever laid aside.

We may now, perhaps, dimly foresee the momentous consequences to which this principle of economy may

lead when generally applied to the doctrines and practices of the Roman Church as to those of other churches. Let us quote some examples of possible applications. The central act of worship in the Roman Church is built upon the dogma that, at a particular moment, in consequence of the action of a priest, the Deity embodies itself in, and identifies itself with a material object, which then is eaten and digested, and passes with sanctifying effects into the moral and spiritual nature of its recipient. This is in itself a very coarse materialising conception, and the worship founded upon it is a gross idolatory. Yet such worship may be defended as an economy; no truth in itself, though it may perhaps have been, in a coarse materialising age, the nearest approximation to truth that teachers could frame or worshippers receive. The truth that is hid behind it is that Deity can and does infuse itself into man; and the fixing of a particular moment of time and the appointment of a material ceremony may once have been a help to the realisation of that truth. Is not perhaps the time approaching when progressive minds within the Roman Church may penetrate to the truth which lies hid behind their ceremony, and lay aside the idolatrous notion which has mixed itself with its practice and its very essence?

The whole sacramental system of the Roman Church can only be defended as a series of applications of this principle of economy. In themselves the pretensions of ecclesiastical officials to forgive the sins of their fellow-men, or to convey to them the grace of God, are simply impostures, and the formulæ, in which men pretend to convey or to exert such powers, hardly fall short of blasphemy. Yet it is imaginable that, in times of great ignorance, such pretensions and expressions may have been a means of assuring the ignorant, that God does forgive, and does bestow His grace. Is it not time that formulæ, which are now seen to be presumptuous and misleading, and in which those who pronounce them no longer believe, should in the Roman and in all other churches be laid aside, as economies which may once have shadowed forth a truth, but now only serve to prolong the existence of a falsehood?

But this principle of economy, if admitted, may be found applicable to still higher subjects. The Roman Church still holds, with nearly the whole of Christendom, that the supernatural birth, and physical resurrection of Jesus of Nazareth, together with the miracles that illustrated His life, were actual facts of history. But, if Mr. Mivart's principle prevails, what hinders them from being treated as economies, adumbrations of, approximations to, unknowable truths—which lie hid behind them? This admission would be all that the mythical school of interpreters desire; and, if the Church of Rome accepts it, there will be free course for that school of interpretation within her pale.

Even the highest and most fundamental point of all—the existence of a personal God—is brought by our writer himself within the reach of his principle of economy. For, says he,

> Our conceptions of His perfection and attributes are true in the sense that they are infinitely truer than would be their negation. Nevertheless they are utterly inadequate, and God remains absolutely incomprehensible. It is easy to say that He is Omnipresent, Omniscient, and Omnipotent; but it is difficult to realise that no action has ever taken place without His active concurrence, so that everything which exists or energizes must possess a certain goodness and a certain beauty, apart, of course, from bad volitions.

Thus the ultimate result of the application of the principle *may*, perhaps *must*, be to reduce Jesus Christ and God Himself into economies, each a shadow, made dimly visible to man, of truths which are entirely beyond his understanding. Our author's position of mind is, though he is not himself conscious of it, identical with that of the Agnostics whom he reproves.

It appears, then, that leading minds, even in that which is supposed to be the most conservative of all churches, have thrown themselves, like those elsewhere, upon the current of the *Zeitgeist*, unconscious whither it may lead them. But what line will the authorities of that Church take upon the questions thus thrown out for discussion? The probability is that, like all other ecclesiastics, their first consideration will be, not truth, but policy. They will be very careful not to commit themselves, or to make any pronouncement which may hereafter have to be retracted. Authorities of a Church which claims infallibility need to be most careful to avoid mistakes; for such mistakes, when discovered, cannot be confessed or retracted, although our author has shown that they may be indirectly corrected by the application of the principle of economy. It is therefore probable that neither Pope nor Cardinal Archbishop will have a word to say in this controversy. The present policy of those astute ecclesiastics who pull the wires behind the papal throne has altered much in our times. Pius IX. attempted to guide public opinion with very doubtful success. Leo XIII. takes the safer course of swimming with the stream in everything except the purely secular question of the temporal power. The Roman ecclesiastics will wait to see whereto this thing may grow; and our London professor will miss that best advertisement which a book can have—to be included in the *Index Librorum Prohibitorum*.

THE CHURCH AND THE BODILY HEALTH.

ABSTACT OF A PAPER BY THE REV. F. LAWRENCE, HON. SECRETARY OF THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND BURIAL REFORM ASSOCIATION, READ AT THE HEALTH CONGRESS, HELD AT HASTINGS.

THE Mosaic Church gave much attention to the bodily health. The laws regulating isolation in cases of infectious diseases, such as leprosy, were the very perfection of quarantine; while the mode of disposal of decaying substances in the earth has been acknowledged in these enlightened days to be the most salutary known.

The Christian Church has also, like her Founder, paid great regard to the health of the body. Recognising the precariousness of infant life, she sanctions Baptism at the house when there is sufficient cause. She bids all to keep the body in temperance, soberness, and chastity, and not to covet nor desire other men's goods, but to learn and labour truly to get their own living; thus supplying a perfect rule for keeping a sound mind in a sound body. She takes cognizance of the youth and maiden arrived at years of discretion, and requires them to renew their baptismal vows, to renounce the devil and all his works, the pomps and vanity of this wicked world, and all the sinful lusts of the flesh. To those who have not the gift of continency she recommends marriage as honourable for the mutual society, help, and comfort that the one ought to have of the other in sickness and in health. She rejoices with the mother after the hour of peril in

child-birth, exhorts all to arrange their worldly affairs while in health, and, when sickness comes, strives to comfort and cheer. In extreme cases she allows the minister to communicate alone with the sick person. When death closes this earthly scene she mourns with the bereaved, und holds out the hope of a joyous resurrection. The corpse is to he borne either into the church or *toward the grave*, thus providing against the possible spread of infection ; the body is to be made ready to be laid into the earth ; and earth is to be cast upon it by some standing by, that is, upon the corpse or body, not the coffin. And such burial, when honestly carried out, is found to be so completely in accordance with natural law, that insects, birds, and beasts, wild and tame, practise the same. Moreover, the rubric directing such simple burial is not only the law of the Church, but also the law of sanitary science, and is consistent both with the welfare of the living, and due respect to the dead ; and that it is feasible is shown in some of our old churchyards where, the burials having been few and simple, the ground has received the dead for centuries with harm to none.

Thus the Church is the great national sanitary agency, and her officers, who have unique authority and influence in every parish in the land, are called upon to take an active part in promoting the bodily welfare of all, and among other things to endeavour to bring back the nation to a sanitary mode of burial.

CORRESPONDENCE.

To the Editor of the CHURCH OF ENGLAND PULPIT AND ECCLESIASTICAL REVIEW.

INSPIRATION, EXCLUSIVE OR NOT?

SIR,—In one place in his letter to the PULPIT of the 7th inst., "F. T. P," says that "Inspiration is not revelation ;" while in another he asserts that the "moralist, by Divine assistance (inspiration) arrives at ethical truth, his discoveries being, in fact, *revelations*." This is a plain contradiction ; he must remove it ; and he must tell us what *he* means by inspiration, and point out *his* distinction between inspiration and revelation, before he can with any propriety propose the question which stands at the head of this letter.

He speaks of the inspiration of the moralist, of the Jew in holiness, of the Greek in philosophy, of the Christian in religion, and then, on the strength of this mixture, he claims inspiration for the Parsīs ! Would it not be better for him to stay at home and regulate his mental furniture a little better, than to go abroad with the view of teaching people on a subject of which he has shown that he knows nothing properly ? There is no use in my proceeding any further, by way of reply, until I know what he means. I do not wish to misconceive his meaning, and I have no desire to misrepresent him.

January 19th, 1893. R. DONALDSON.

SIR,—The subjoined excerpt on the "Observance of Sunday," which I cut from the Melbourne *Bible Echo*, may be of interest to your readers :

"Some friend unknown recently sent us a tract containing the substance of two discourses by Pastor Jno. Turner, of Melbourne, on the subject of the Sabbath. We noticed one paragraph in particular which we transcribe for our readers :—

"'We do not profess to observe the Jews' Sabbath, or seventh day ; nor have we any Scriptural authority for the observance of the first day We are told that the apostles met on the first day of the week, but we are not told that it was a rule for them to meet on the first day of every week. Indeed, we find no authority for the prohibition of work or occupation on the first day of the week till the conversion of Constantine. In his celebrated edict 321 A.D., he prohibited all judicial proceedings on the Lord's day, and it was followed by prohibitions to many other occupations, and many forms of amusement held innocent on ordinary days. This great man, Emperor of the Romans, was the instrument, in the Lord's hand, of transmitting to us a day of rest—called the Lord's day, or Sunday—which we esteem as a great favour, and trust it may still be continued by the blessing of the Lord.'

"We call especial attention to the statement that 'This great man, Emperor of the Romans, was the instrument of transmitting a day of rest, which we esteem a great favour.' A very remarkable statement that, coming from a Protestant and from a denomination that has taken a high stand for the Bible as the only rule of faith and practice. We do not criticise the truthfulness of the statement ; we believe it to be all too true ; but as an admission it is astounding, and should open the eyes of those who read it to the path they are following. God says, the seventh day is the Sabbath of the Lord thy God. Constantine gave us the Sunday.

January 18th, 1893. THINKER.

THE KINGDOM OF GOD AND OF HEAVEN.

SIR,—St. Matthew reports that our Lord desired the appointed Twelve, when commissioning them, to preach the kingdom of heaven. St. Luke reports of the same, that our Lord desired them to preach the kingdom of God. Mr. Hobson's inference from this is that the two kingdoms are identical. My inference is that St. Matthew, who was an eye and ear witness, reports more accurately than St. Luke does from hearsay. This is of course on the understanding that St. Matthew was the author of the Life of our Lord attributed to him ; for which belief of its authorship there is strong reason.

The parable of the grain of mustard seed which grew into so great a tree that birds built their nests in its branches, points to the establishment on earth of an organic society, which society must be the Church, the body of Christ. The leaven that was hidden in the flour till the whole was leavened, points to an organic operation ; "the whole," if it mean anything, meaning the whole society. I know no other interpretation that is consistent or reasonable.

I do not know what eminent authorities say that the Church spoken of in the Gospels twice, and in the Epistles in many places, and that is identified with our Lord's body by St. Paul, is any but a real, tangible, visible, outward institution, as real, tangible, visible, and outward as the Israelitish nation, the organisation of which its organisation is very like and closely analogous to. There are plenty of persons who believe an invisible Church different from the real one ; I do not, and I believe it is a figment of their brain. The Communion of Saints is not an organism that is anywhere in Scripture spoken of as such.

STUDENT.

PREFERMENTS AND APPOINTMENTS.

Baines, Rev. Charles Frederick, M.A., Chaplain to the Forces, Fourth Class.
Bennic, Rev. James Noble, LL.D., Rector of Glenfield, Leicester ; Honorary Canon of Peterborough Cathedral.
Berry, Rev. W. A. B., M.A., Curate of St. Mary's, Penzance ; Vicar of Stanwell, near Staines.
Bower, Rev. R., M.A., Vicar of St. Cuthbert's, Carlisle ; Rural Dean of Carlisle South.
Bree, Rev. E. H. ; Rector of Stow, near Lincoln.
Britton, Rev. R. W., Curate ; Vicar of St. George's, Kendal.
Coe, Rev. J. W.. D.D. ; Vicar of Westmarsh, Kent.
Ellerton, Rev. Frank G., Curate of Bebington, Birkenhead ; Rector of Warmingham, Cheshire.
Elliott, Rev. T. H., M.A., Vicar of Totnes ; Surrogate for the Diocese of Exeter.
Gibson, Rev. T. W., M.A. ; Rector of All Saints'-with-St. John's, Huntingdon.
Gillett, Rev. Charles Thomas, M.A. ; Vicar of Fenny Stratford, Bucks.
Harford, Rev. Edward John, M.A. ; Rector of Marston Bigott, Frome.
Hartley, Rev. W. H. S., M.A., Curate of Ilkley ; Vicar of Morton, near Bingley.
Holmes, Rev. B. E., M.A., Rector of King William's Town ; Rural Dean of King William's Town.
Horsfall, Rev. Richard Hamilton, M.A. ; Perpetual Curate of Arkholme, Kirby Lonsdale.
Johnson, Rev. Christopher, L.Th. ; Perpetual Curate of Ugthorpe, Whitby.
Jones, Rev. Griffith Hartwell, M.A., Professor of Latin at the University College of South Wales and Monmouthshire, and Curate of the Welsh Church, Cardiff ; Rector of Nutfield, Surrey.
Kersley, Rev. Steward Roper, M.A. ; Rector of Congham, Norfolk.
M'Cleverty, Rev. Robert, Senior Curate at St. Peter's, Wolverhampton ; Vicar of St. Chad's, Stafford.
Maddison, Rev. W., M.A., Vicar of St. Augustine's, Teignmouth ; Rector of Gosforth, Newcastle-on-Tyne.
Martin, Rev. Cecil, M.A. ; Perpetual Curate of Leighland, Taunton.
Mullins, Rev. T. P., LL.D., Chaplain to the Forces, Third Class ; Chaplain to the Forces, Second Class.
Neep, Rev. William H., Curate of St. Mary's, Bootle, Liverpool ; Vicar of Shackerston-with-Odstone, near Atherstone.
Pearse, Rev. J. T., M.A., Vicar of Brabourne, Kent ; Rector of Chiddingstone, Edenbridge, Kent.
Rolfe, Rev. Charles J., Curate-in-Charge of Stockton-heath, near Warrington ; Rector of St. Edmund's, Burlingham, near Norwich.
Sewell, Rev. Henry, M.A., Curate of Rhosddu, near Wrexham : Senior Mathematical Master at the Grammar School, Bury.
Shenton, Rev. G. D., B.A., Curate of St. Peter's, Tiverton ; Precentor of Sydney Cathedral.
Syer, Rev. Canon, M.A., Rector of Barnack ; Rural Dean of Peterborough Second Deanery.
Thomson, Rev. H. Worsley, M.A., Vicar of Helperthorpe ; Chaplain at Ghent.
Wilkins, Rev. Montague Cuthbert, Curate of Limber Magna, Ulceby ; Vicar of Croft, Lincolnshire.
Wilson, Rev. Ralph V. ; Chaplain to the *Minotaur* (temporarily).
Wimberley, Rev. C. F. A., M.A., late Master of the Choir School and Precentor of Holy Trinity, Kingston-upon-Hull ; Head Master of Chard Grammar-school.
Wood, Rev. William Manners, M.A., Rector of Church Lawford, Rugby ; Rector of Littleton, near Staines.

CLERICAL OBITUARY.

Hall, Rev. Tansley, Rector of Boylestone, Derbyshire, at Oakamoor, Bournemouth, on the 20th inst., aged 81.
Lewis. Rev. Lewis, son of the late Captain Lewis Lewis, of Trynllwyn, Radnorshire, and for nearly forty years Vicar of Llanthony Abbey, Mon.. on the 13th inst.
Money, Rev. Charles Forbes Septimus, M.A., Hon. Canon of Rochester, at Billing Vicarage, near Maidstone, on the 18th inst., aged 75.
Norris, Rev. William, at Warblington Rectory, Havant, on the 21st inst., aged 97.

FIRST REMOVE THE CAUSE.

MEN frequently worry and trouble themselves a great deal in trying to cure the symptoms of vital weakness, nervous exhaustion, and kindred ailments, instead of endeavouring to first remove the cause. This can be done by Mr. Harness' Electropathic Treatment without the aid of drugs. It is useless to tell sufferers to employ their minds and bodies in useful work and to forget their disorders, so long as the cause of their troubles is not removed. How can it be expected that when they are fatigued by the least exertion they can occupy themselves by studying, walking, or other exercise? Even in conversation they frequently lose the thread of it and repeatedly find their memory failing them. What can they do? Physic will not cure them—perhaps the leading physicians have fallen to afford them any relief, and they have consequently become hopeless. It is to such as these that Mr. Harness' new combined Electropathic Belt and Suspensory is so strongly recommended, as, by its gentle but continuous action, invigorating electric currents are imperceptibly generated and conveyed direct from the spinal cord to the affected parts. It is this scientifically constructed and convenient appliance which silently but surely acts upon the vital organs, and removes the cause of the patient's disease, effecting a wonderful change in his health, character, and conduct, and speedily enabling him to return to his natural tastes and habits, and enjoy once more the full vigour of youth, with all its accompanying pleasures.

We may add that this perfect Electro-medical appliance is exceedingly comfortable to wear, gives wonderful support and vitality to all the internal organs of the body, prevents chills, imparts new life and vigour to the debilitated constitution, stimulates the organic action, promotes the circulation, assists digestion, and promptly renews that vital energy, the loss of which is the first symptom of decay. Its healing properties are multifarious. It stimulates the functions of various organs, increases their secretions, gives tone to muscle and nerves, relaxes morbid contractions, improves nutrition, and effectually renews exhausted nerve force. Acting directly on the system, it sustains and assists its various functions, and thus promotes the health and vigour of the entire frame. Besides these benefits, the mind is maintained in a buoyant, cheerful state, and every faculty is stimulated to the highest condition of intellectual strength.

Gentlemen who read the above announcement have only to visit London and call at the Electropathic and Zander Institute (52, Oxford Street, W.) to be convinced of the marvellous curative powers of Electricity and Mr. Harness' perfect methods of imperceptibly applying the current. The medical officers of the establishment are in daily attendance, and may by consulted free of charge either personally or by letter.

The Church of England Pulpit.

LOST OPPORTUNITIES.

BY THE REV. O. L. S. P. JENKINS, CURATE OF WARMSWORTH, NEAR EDLINGTON.

SERMON PREACHED AT EDLINGTON, DONCASTER, ON SUNDAY, MAY 15TH, 1892.

"Many will say to me in that day, Lord, have we not prophesied in Thy Name; and in Thy Name have cast out devils; and in Thy Name done many wondrous works?"—MATT. vii. 22.

I HAVE lately seen a cartoon by "Cynicus," who is the Hogarth of his day, and, like him, lashes with unsparing hand the follies and hypocrisies of his age. In this cartoon we have on one side the porch of a church, with the inscription over the porch: "Come, buy wine without money and without price." Going up the steps we see one solitary worshipper, judging from her appearance an elderly woman in one of the lower ranks of life. Thus has the caricaturist given expression to the well-known fact that women are more devout than men. On the other side we see the entrance to the pit of the theatre, and a surging crowd outside jostling each other in their eagerness to get in. The doors are not yet open. On the walls of the theatre we see handbills and placards bearing the inscription, "Crimes of Paris." That is the name of the play. On another poster we see written large the words, "Advanced Prices," which tells the public that so great is the run that the proprietors have felt safe in demanding more than the usual price. And to see what? A representation of the scum, the degradation, the abominations of one of the foulest cities in Europe. That is the cartoon. Is it true? Did "Cynicus" draw on his imagination for it, or did he, note-book in hand, go round to the churches of London, and then to the theatres, and note how many went into each? And did he see the churches comparatively empty? I imagine he did so, and this is what the acknowledged satirist of the age has to say.

But I have the reverse of that cartoon in my text. If "Cynicus" went to translate my text he would quite reverse his other. He should have the pit of the theatre quite empty, not a solitary one seeking it; the crimes of Paris would have no attention whatever. It is the other side that is crowded now. Millions and millions vast myriads, are now crowding each other on the other side. It is the church porch sought after now and the theatre deserted. And what has made all the difference? It is easily explained. While the theatre was sought after it was in the heyday of life, it was when the animal spirits were lively, and when enjoyment seemed to be the great end and aim of life. It was when death and sorrow seemed far off in the distance, and when conscience was asleep. At the period my text speaks of it is no longer so, the realities of eternity have come to be felt and seen, and man has to stand before his Maker and Judge. It is in that day when many will say, Lord, have we not prophesied in Thy Name? have we not cast out devils? and in Thy Name done many wonderful works? Now the Judge to whom this argument is addressed takes no notice of it whatever; it is not the day for listening to any advances, but the day of doom, the day for result, for reckoning up. These very people were invited to a conference many times. Come, let us reason together; if your sins were as scarlet, they shall become white as snow; if your sins were deep dyed as crimson, they should become as wool. But they then refused that conference; they wanted to attend the theatre and see the crimes of Paris acted, and a thousand other like things; they had no time whatever for such a conference as to reason about their sins. The Judge does not deny their claims. There will be many wonderful men in that crowd, many who will have writ their names large in the perishing scroll of time. It is said that Simon Magus, of infamous memory, made a statue move and speak at Rome, and called down fire from heaven. Indeed, many have thought he was the second beast mentioned by John in the revelation, because of the wonderful works he did. Therefore the gist of my text is, wasted and lost opportunities. There is great wisdom in these words.

"Oh that while we can we may." These people in my text had the power, they had the opportunity to do well, they had not the will nor the inclination. The only answer the Judge gives to them is, "I know you not." Your time, your talents, your opportunities were not devoted to Me; you went after the chimeras, the will-o'-the-wisps, the shadows of life. You never devoted your power to Me or My cause, you never placed them as a willing sacrifice on My altar, which would have been so acceptable to me. I was afflicted and humbled for you. I divested Myself for you. You never suffered for Me, you never laid aside any of your inclinations for Me. I know you not. It is not our profession in that day that will be taken any account of, but our actions during the day of grace. This is the standard that will measure us.

But let us inquire whether it is in the nature of things that churches should be empty and theatres crowded. Is the theatre then so elevating, is the morality taught there so pure, that the crowds are eager to enter in order to get instructed in it?

And on the other hand are our churches so depressing, so lifeless? are the lessons taught there of so little moment that no one here and there can be found to attend them, in London, about two in a hundred? Nay, rather the reverse. The theatre exists for amusement. It lives on excitement. It aims at instruction only in a much lower degree. The Church aims at conversion and instruction before everything. An actor once met an eminent divine. "Why," asked the divine, "is my church always half empty and your theatre crowded to excess?" "I'll tell you," said the actor, "I conduct myself on the stage as if the thing were real, and you conduct yourself in the pulpit as if the matter were unreal." This is only very partially true. There are hundreds of faithful, earnest, hard-working ministers to-day, who have to bewail deeply their non-success in drawing people around them. We must find another reason then than that of the ac'or's. We find it in the sceptic realistic spirit of the age. We want by any and every means to banish away God from our midst. The spirit of the age says if you must give us a religion, let it be a religion without repentance, without sorrow, without restraint. Give us the respectability of religion, but take away its irksomeness.

True, man wants amusements. We hold no ultra-Puritanical views as to these; and, indeed, who can afford to be so merry as a man who feels his sins are forgiven? A man who is on the verge of bankruptcy, and is hourly expecting an execution cannot feel very happy, neither can a man who has a great load of unforgiven sin. But what a mistake for mortal man to crowd the theatre and desert the Church. To miss the golden opportunity while grasping at the unreal. Rightly did Thomas Jones, the poet-preacher of Wales, say, "Many do with opportunities. as children do at the sea-shore; they fill their little hands with sand, and then let the grains fall through one by one till all are gone." What will all a man can possibly gain at the theatre avail in death's dark hour? At that time it will be the Church, not the theatre, and Christ, not amusement, the welfare of the soul, not the amusement of the day, will be sought after.

There is still another view. Crowds are willing to pay high prices for admittance to a theatre. "Advanced prices" do not deter them. Still they crowd around the doors, especially if the "Crimes of Paris" are to be seen. It is not so with religious matters. Too often the smallest sums are grudgingly given to God's cause. We place every year over £160,000,000 on the altar of Bacchus, and a paltry million on God's altar. While the door of mercy is open, millions refuse to enter; when it will have been shut, these would give myriads of worlds to have it opened. "God keep you from 'It is too late,' says the Spanish proverb. When the fool has made up his mind, the market has gone by." Let us persevere in the right path, even if we have—

> "Alone
> To urge unremittingly the stubborn work,
> Unseconded, unrecompensed."

A day of victory will come for the lonely toiler.

SHUTTING THE GATES OF DERRY.

By the Rev. M. B. HOGG, B.A., Rector of Keady, co. Armagh.

Sermon Preached in Keady Parish Church on Sunday, December 18th, 1892.

"The Lord is my rock, and my fortress, and my deliverer; my God, my strength, in whom I will trust; my buckler, and the horn of my salvation, and my high tower."—Psalm xviii. 2.

NOT unnaturally, Saul threw the javelin at David. It is never palatable to any man, particularly to one who has long enjoyed a dignity or an honour, to find himself thrust aside that another may step into his shoes. But Saul's disobedience justified the rejection: "Because thou hast rejected the word of the Lord, He hath rejected thee from being king." In token of his gratitude to Jehovah for deliverance from Saul's malevolence, David sat down and wrote this psalm, a glowing composition, in which martial similes abound. For example, God is called "my buckler," "my fortress," "my rock," the "horn of my salvation." And it may be here observed that thanksgiving is not only a national but an individual duty. There are few to-day who seem to apprehend this obligation. Eliza Cook, treating a far different theme, once plaintively wrote—

> "Vows are many, truth is rare."

With simple truthfulness it might be affirmed of most of us, "Prayers are many, thanks are rare." Did you, my brothers, offer your grateful thanks to a mighty Deliverer when last you rose from the couch of pain, or at the moment you emerged from your last trouble, or wrong, or danger? Noah, we know, when safely landed after his dangerous tossing on the awful flood of "rain and waters" for many weary months, immediately proceeded to build an altar in gratitude to his Preserver. How many of us who, in critical moments and in sad emergencies, resorted to our God for deliverance and protection, sought His presence again when He "heard our prayer and saw our tears"? Not without deep meaning and subtle experience of human perversity did David write, "I will pay Thee my vows which I spake with my mouth when I was in trouble."

And what straits so terrible, what emergency so critical, as that in which our fathers found themselves in Derry two hundred and four years ago? Truly "the sorrows of death compassed them round

about, and the pains of hell gat hold upon them. They found trouble and heaviness, but they called upon the name of the Lord."

We need not apologise to-day, I think, for recounting the story of the siege and the memorable episode of the shutting of the gates. When the perils are safely passed, we may fairly lay down our arms; but the dangers that beset the citizens of Derry in 1688 are, in a measure, revived in these later times, and there is still need to beat back the enemy from the gates; and until then it is good to "remember the days of old and the years that are past."

And the policy which has long obtained amongst Irish Protestants of ignoring the past, in order that a false, effete, emasculate Liberalism should take the place of determined resistance to Romish agression, has culminated disastrously within the memory of us all. No! our cry to-day is that of the lofty genius who pleaded as never man did for the country, not of his birth, but of his love:

> "Earth! render back from out thy breast
> A remnant of our Spartan dead.
> Of the three hundred, grant but three,
> To make a new Thermopylæ."

Derry, as most of you know, is an old Irish word signifying the place of the oak. It was the site of a Druidic encampment, for the priests of that ancient faith were wont to deliver their oracular sayings seated under a gigantic oak. You remember Boadicea, the British warrior queen, repairing for counsel to her country's "gods."

> "Sage beneath a spreading oak
> Sat the Druid hoary chief."

And in every instance when you discover the word dare, or its modification, you may feel assured that some idea of this kind in involved. Adare, in Limerick, of which Griffin sings, "O sweet Adare, O lovely vale, O soft retreat of sylvan splendour," is but another form of the word "Derry." Derry more, large oak, Derry beg; small oak, and so on. It was in this ancient place St. Columkille lived and flourished, and a woody "sylvan retreat," called St. Columb's, marks the spot where the abbot of Iona abode. The venerable cathedral is built on the ruins of the ancient church of St. Columb. Before 1603, however, Derry was but an obscure place. Subsequently to that date it became an English garrison, and is held in direct grant from the British Crown by a London Board called the Irish Society. Its population was largely British, chiefly of the English section, and at the time of the Revolution (1688) it was a fine, flourishing colony the seat of a Bishop, governed by a Scotsman, Colonel Lundie. When James fled from England, he directed his attention to Ireland, and Derry was called on to open its gates to the deposed monarch. The governor and the bishop with him, together with some leading citizens, counselled obedience to the mandate.

But in the dusk of a December evening the more fiery spirits of the town clamorously repelled the advice of the governor, and thirteen apprentices seized the keys, locked the gates, and bravely shouted "No Surrender" to the soldiery, whom James had despatched to demand the possession of the city.

Now we know exactly what that resolute action meant. It meant that the citizens voluntarily cut themselves off from all communication with the outer world; it meant possible death to all within the walls who would not surrender; it meant a probable victory for the enemy, for a hostile force quickly took up its position outside the gates; and in a dreary winter month the prospect before the citizens was by no means inviting. But the dauntless spirit of the heroic apprentices was electric and reciprocal. It quickly spread over all within the town. Resolutely, manfully, in spite of the dreariest and most adverse contingencies, they determined all to give up their lives, if need be, for the cause they loved so well. For a few weeks it was not so appalling. The new year came, and there was hope of William's arrival. But spring approached and supplies were failing, and to crown their misfortunes the saturnine devilry of James had devised a plan whereby he hoped to coerce the hapless citizens into unwilling surrender. Across the river, some three miles from the city, he placed a massive "boom" or chain, in order that no ship might approach with relief to the citizens. But in the month of August, when the hopes of the brave defenders had well-nigh fled, the "Mountjoy," under Commander Kirk, struck the boom successfully, dashed through it triumphantly, and in a short space of time had come to the relief of the beleaguered people. I know the spot well where the "boom" was laid, and as one on an August day walks along the banks of the Foyle, girdled by a zone of fair hills, studded with fields already white to the harvest, the lines of Freedom's poet come floating into the mind, fragrant with the subtle odour of the historic surroundings—

> "The mountains look on Marathon,
> And Marathon looks on the sea;
> And musing there an hour alone,
> I dreamt that Greece might yet be free,
> For standing by the Persian's grave,
> I could not deem myself a slave."

That is the story of the siege, my brothers. Does it not appeal to us all to-day? Assuredly.

> "Must we but weep on scenes more blest,
> Must we but blush—our fathers bled."

And I think we may learn from this wonderful incident a lesson pregnant with importance. We are a favoured nation; our presence here to-day is more than a coincidence, it is a memorial of God's favour and goodness. Surely He has had a most visible design in retaining Protestantism in Ulster?

Derry to-day holds as then the key of the situation. Ever loyal to the English connexion, her sons wherever they have gone have carried with

them the glorious faith of their forefathers. We know and are stirred by the names of such Derry men as Lawrence, Montgomery, and the poet-prelate William Alexander, whose judicious and glowing Protestantism is of a more fervid type than that of his predecessor in 1688.

In distant Australia, in icy Canada, in fresh and ever fragrant America, Derry's sons have planted in the soil the roots of as firm a faith and as loyal as swelled the noble breasts of the deathless heroes of the siege.

Think you they held the pass in vain, those noble champions of the faith once delivered to the saints? No. God's purpose is manifest to-day in the sudden but resolute action of the impetuous thirteen. They resisted then in order that the true Catholic faith, for which we are all willing to lay down our very lives, might to-day illumine not merely this fair but distracted land, but also the dark places of the earth, whither Ulster colonists and Irish Protestants, with all the zeal and fervour of the Pilgrim Fathers, have gone forth bravely as Abraham "not knowing where they went."

Like the holy dead, whose bones, lie beneath the shadow of the cathedral sanctuary, we, their descendants of an age neither as chivalrous nor as holy, must resist even to the end the machinations of the subtle enemy at our gates. It is urged by plausible time-servers and modern "Pliables" that "Home Rule," as it is softly termed, can at least "do no harm," and may possibly do good. But such reasoning is eminently fallacious.

The Trojans who yielded to the Greeks, caught by fair speeches and glowing promises, argued similarly, and repented in sackcloth and ashes. James II. of execrable memory proclaimed an edict of toleration, and history discloses the occult meaning of this sinister declaration. Plausible political tricksters predicted an era of golden peace and plenty, when the "alien" Church by law established, termed flippantly "Episcopal" by pert and irresponsible critics, should be disestablished and disendowed. The cry, *Delenda est Carthago* again was raised, and the ancient Church of St. Patrick was sacrificed to appease the voracity of Rome, to assuage the asperity of Irish Dissent, and to elaborate the schemes of an anarchic and unscrupulous minister. But both Protestant Dissenters and Romanists in Ireland find themselves by no means relieved of those fiscal disabilities under which they groaned so heavily, and by many the incredulous query is now urged in reference to that act of spoliation—*Cui bono?*

We must resist the encroachments of our Church's bitter foes, not with the malevolence they so plainly exhibit, but with a firmness bred of faith and fostered by the zeal not of party but of holiness.

For I take it, my brethren, the glorious inspiration of the dauntless band of apprentices, which moved them to shut the gates on that December eve, was not a political, but a religious one. It was God-given. Not a parrot cry of "No Surrender," as many brainless, unspiritual people to-day understand it, but an utterance bold, and faithful, and uncompromising; and withal as solemn and as free from spasmodic gush as that weighty pronouncement voiced by ten thousand lips, "We will not have Home Rule."

That cry of 1688 came from hearts convinced of truth and righteousness. It was the declaration of youths who, like the faithful Bishop of Ephesus, had from childhood "known the Holy Scriptures, which are able to make wise unto salvation": and when next you utter it, my brethren, see that you realise deeply all it means. To be an apprentice boy of that type means to be a Christian soldier, not a mere Orange drummer or village "corner boy," whose flag bears the motto of the Cross, as well as the symbols of political victory.

Suffer me, in conclusion, to quote for you lines written long ago by one who for years wisely and jealously guarded the interests of the apprentice boys in Derry:

> "Brave Thirteen, who closed the gate,
> In December hoary,
> In the keep of '88,
> Hallowed be your glory.
> Glowing still your fame shall be,
> Pride of all posterity;
> Potent e'er to arm the free
> Apprentice Boys of Derry."

THE *Rock* states that Canon Browne, of St. Paul's, has accepted the post of secretary to the London Diocesan Home Mission.

CANON C. W. BARDSLEY, vicar of Ulverston, and brother of the Bishop of Carlisle, has resigned his benefice consequent upon failing health and impaired eyesight. The resignation was made known to the congregation on Sunday by means of a printed circular letter placed in the pews of the parish church.

THE installation of the new Dean of Peterborough (Canon W. C. Ingram) will take place on Monday, February 13th. The *Yorkshire Post* states that owing to the agricultural depression the value of the deanery has declined so seriously that, it is said, the new Dean will not reside at the deanery, but will let it. The *Northampton Herald* says it is understood that Mrs. Argles, widow of the late Dean, will continue to occupy the deanery.

ON the 18th ult. the Bishop of Marlborough invited the readers of the diocese to his residence at Kensington, where the Bishop of London had kindly promised to met them. The Bishop of Bedford was also present. The evening was passed in friendly intercourse with each other, one of the primary objects being that the readers might know each other better, and be able to compare notes respecting their work. At frequent intervals some select songs were well rendered by the Bishop's daughters and the boys belonging to the choir of St. Michael's, Cornhill.

NOTICES.

All communications respecting the Literary portion of the paper should be addressed to the Editor.

Business communications of every kind should be addressed to Mr. S. GIBBON, at the CHURCH OF ENGLAND PULPIT Office, 160, Fleet Street, London, E.C., to whom cheques and Post-office orders for subscriptions (in advance), three months, 2s., six months, 3s. 6d., twelve months, 6s. 6d., are to be made payable.

The Cases for binding Vol. XXXIV. are now ready.

FOR HEALTH AND IMMORTALITY.

The Ecclesiastical Review.

SATURDAY, FEBRUARY 4, 1893.

EVENING COMMUNION.

CONSIDERABLE comment, not to say consternation, has been caused by the Archbishop of York's recent condemnation of Evening Communion. Dr. Maclagan, although expressing a qualified dissent from what is impertinently termed the "high view" of the Sacrament (as if all other views were common and unclean), and admitting that he has no power to forbid evening celebration, yet threatens with his displeasure all those clergy who do not yield to his guidance, and abandon what he considers the offensive practice. For the clergy of the Northern Province the position may be serious; the pressure which an "ordinary" can bring to bear, if he chooses, is by no means light, and within limits there is no appeal against him. If the Archbishop chooses to go to extremes of persecution, there is nothing to stop him, and Lord Grimthorpe's warning may be justified, that "Sacerdotalism under irresponsible bishops may be very little easier than under that respectable old gentleman at Rome and his vicegerents." How long this is possible is quite another matter. It is a nice question whether a diocese is to be regulated at the absolute personal discretion of the bishop for the time being. Perhaps Dr. Maclagan's successor (*absit omen*) may be opposed to Early Morning Communion; a future Archbishop of Canterbury may object to extempore sermons; another may insist on all his clergy intoning the service. In fact, the position is perfectly preposterous that any prelate should claim the right "to object to and do all in his power to discourage" any lawful usage. They are "prave orts," but the Archbishop will probably end by eating them and the leek too.

Meantime it is something to have it admitted by sacerdotalists that Evening Communion, though wicked, is lawful. Better still to have their objection to it narrowed down to the fact that it is an innovation. Here they have all the worst of the argument. The Divine institution of the rite is the strong point of the upholders of evening celebrations. Drawing our authority exclusively from the Bible, we take our stand upon the most solemn ground conceivable; we quote 1 Cor. xi. 23, sqq., and say, this is the earliest and immeasurably the most authoritative utterance upon this sacred question, having its origin, as the first words declare, in no earthly source. And the only reply the sacerdotalists can make is that our Lord's institution was "exceptional." We grant that. How does it touch the question? Next we have the unbroken custom of the Apostles; in St. Paul's most careful deliverances we get no hint of any alteration of the customary hour of celebration. But the sacerdotalists find it convenient to skip the Apostles and pass on to the Primitive Church; and there we unquestionably find early celebrations the rule, and the reason is given—abuses had crept in, and the hour was altered to avoid them. Moreover, during the long period of persecution, it was a matter of necessity for the faithful to meet early in the morning, at or before daybreak, the only time when they were tolerably secure from interruption. So, in reality, early, and not late, celebrations are the innovation introduced alike from motives of discipline and security. In process of time long continued custom, and the sacredness of early association, perpetuated the practice. The blood of the martyrs, the dearest trials of the faith, were intimately connected with the early celebration of the rite, and thus it became fixed in the Primitive Church. This view, logic and history alike, force upon any one who brings an open mind to the consideration of the subject. It justifies early celebration, but it leaves untouched, if it does not emphasise, the case for evening celebration. To describe the latter as an innovation is absurd, and gives a significant hint of the risk that constantly besets us of accepting tradition as authority, and preaching for doctrine the commandments of men. Deeply interesting, highly suggestive as early celebrations may be, they can have no more solemn associations than those connected with the hour of the Lord's act and words of institution.

This matter of innovation may, however, be argued further. If the Primitive Church knew no celebration at eight in the evening, neither did it know one at eight in the morning—the hour was about daybreak; so the customary hour of celebration in these days is positively an innovation upon an innovation. And if Primitive precedents are to be invariably followed, where may the line be drawn? We have already seen where it is not. In the Lincoln judgment a number of usages repugnant to many Protestants, and nowise in

harmony with the principles of the Reformation, have been justified by this adroit referring back beyond the Prayer Book, and not quite as far as to the Bible. Not that there is any open attempt to set up the absolute authority of the Primitive Church; that might be awkward. With consummate authority the modern heir to all the Apostles and Fathers picks and chooses the bits of his inheritance which take his fancy, early celebration, confession, penance, mass, and what not. Why not exorcism, excommunication, etc.? When and where are these priests going to stop? We take leave to question this devotion to the Primitive Church, which seems of a marvellously opportune character —that word "Primitive" is wonderfully elastic—it is a generous broad-backed sort of word, capable of spreading over many centuries. It is heavily loaded now though, and one of the burdens is suspiciously like a bundle labelled Transubstantiation, and kicked off 350 years ago as neither profitable nor even possible of carriage. Whereas the robust Protestant is moved to cry out: "*Aut Cæsar, aut nullus.* Take the Primitive Church altogether, if you will, we could have wished it a better deliverance; only leave us our Bible and Prayer Book, and, if you can, our conscience."

But if Evening Communion were an innovation, which it is not, so are most of the details which characterise our services; the evening sermon, for instance, nay the evening, instead of afternoon service; children's services and special services of many kinds; chanting much of the service, and the surpliced choirs who do the chanting (not always to the use of edifying); intoning the prayers and droning the lessons. Our great grandfathers, could they return to us, would hardly recognise their own parish church now-a-days. But we have not yet had any archbishop denouncing any of these things—doubtless they all come straight out of the Primitive Church. Why not have the service in Latin?

A word of reply is needed to those clergy who have not scrupled to assert that Evening Communion is a positive hindrance to would-be communicants. Figures are quoted to show that since the abolition of Evening Communion in certain churches, the number of communicants has vastly increased. The fallacy lies in a *post hoc, ergo propter hoc* argument. In naked truth the assertion is that A who would communicate at 8 a.m., and B who would communicate at noon deliberately abstain, being scandalised at the conduct of C who communicates at 8 p.m. And the proof of this incredible statement is represented to be that, after C's reprehensible proceedings are stopped, A and B come to the Lord's Table as if there could be no other reason. In using figures like this clergymen mislead, sometimes we fear wilfully, their readers. Of late years it has been the custom to multiply celebrations and in every way to emphasise the importance and the duty of regular and constant Communion. Years ago few churches had a celebration more than once a month, and perhaps the majority of parishioners limited their attendance to four times a year. Now weekly celebrations are the rule—in most churches twice or more each Sunday, often once or twice in the week, and, in many cases at least, once every day. The significance of all this is obvious; there has been a tremendous rekindling of enthusiasm, not always properly controlled, in the matter of the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper. But there is not a scrap of proof that it is due to the occasional abolition of Evening Communion.

Cutting through these webs of sophistry, we come to the real objection to Evening Communion. It is what is called the "high view" of the Sacrament, really a materialistic and low view. It is what has suggested fasting Communion. If not transubstantiation, it is something very like it; it is at least thoroughly sacerdotal and un-Protestant. Whatever enhances the dignity and importance (from a low point of view) of the service which the priest has now the sole right of conducting enhances the office of the priest. The Sacrament becomes a sacrifice from which nothing must be omitted which can mark off the difference between priest and people. We need hardly dwell upon the gross materialism of fasting Communion, with its corollaries of mixings and ablutions. It was briefly dismissed, some years ago, by a distinguished preacher and man of common sense, the late rector of St. George's. A clergyman came to him and besought him to take a midday celebration in his stead, as he felt he should faint. Said the rector, "Why should you faint?" "Because I have a celebration at eight a.m. as well, and I shall not be able to endure fasting till noon." "If that's your reason," said the rector—one of the kindest of men, by the way—"you may go and faint."

All things considered, however, perhaps the Archbishop's threats are for the best; the opposition they have provoked and the discussion they have set going will turn people's minds into the right channels. Just as the one good thing we have to thank the Lincoln judgment for is the official declaration that what is known in High-Church slang as "Catholic ritual" is really mere puerile trumpery, so shall we be beholden to Dr. Maclagan for publicly confessing that the only points in which Evening Communion differs from all other lawful usages at present current in our Church are that it is rather more ancient and more orthodox.

OF THE DIVINE METHOD OF PROMOTING HOLINESS.

Among religious teachers there are various modes of instruction, which have come to be distinguished by different names. Thus, among the preachers of our own Anglican Communion, we have three distinct

schools known respectively as the High, the Low, and the Broad. Yet all these men profess the selfsame object, namely, the advancement of virtue and holiness. Their sole diversity, therefore, lies in the choice of means. Under such circumstances it must be both interesting and profitable to take a calm and impartial view of the plan on which the Divine Being himself proceeds in His exhortations to holiness throughout the sacred Scriptures.

In both the Old Testament and the New, that plan is universally as follows : Of His own mere goodness and grace the Almighty Father, previously to their obedience and without respect to it, having conferred on men certain blessings, He first of all impresses upon their minds the fact of these unmerited blessings, and, having done so, He then reminds them of their own consequent obligations to Himself. Thus He ever deals with men as an affectionate parent with his children, and His constant desire is that their obedience should be the spontaneous growth of gratitude and love. The office of faith, that great first principle in theology, is, not to render God propitious to us, but merely to recognise and realise His goodness and free grace. Faith is the exact correlative of free grace. Strictly speaking, it performs no work whatever, but is passive, simply receiving what is freely bestowed by grace. Hence believing in the Lord is in one or two places called "tasting," tasting that the Lord is good or gracious, not, let us observe, making the Lord good or gracious, but tasting what He already and always is, namely, good and gracious. "It is of faith," says St. Paul, speaking of the promise of the Gospel, "that it might be by grace."

Now let us consider the manner of the calls to obedience addressed to the ancient Jews, to whom formerly, as we read, pertained "the adoption, and the glory, and the covenants, and the giving of the law, and the service of God, and the promises;" all which vast privileges and honours, let us remember, were bestowed on the whole Jewish Church, on the evil members as well as on the good, by the free grace of that God who "will have mercy on whom He will have mercy," not on account of any merit or goodness in themselves beyond the rest of mankind, not, says God to them, "not for thy righeousness, for thou art a stiff-necked people"; but all which were intended as motives to love and obedience on their part. In the seventh of Deuteronomy we find the free grace referred to in these words : "Thou art an holy people unto the Lord thy God : the Lord thy God hath chosen thee to be a special people unto Himself, above all the people that are upon the face of the earth." And then on the footing of this free grace, which was to be acknowledged and realised by simple faith, comes the duty : "Thou shalt *therefore* keep the commandments, and the statutes, and the judgments, which I command thee this day, to do them." In Isaiah xliii. we read : "This people have I formed for myself; they *shall* show forth My praise." First there is the free grace bestowed liberally on the whole people ; God formed the people for Himself. Then there is the duty which they are in consequence called upon to perform ; they are to show forth the praise of Him who has thus formed them for Himself. In Jeremiah xiii. we have : "For as the girdle cleaveth to the loins of a man, so have I caused to cleave unto Me the *whole* house of Israel and the *whole* house of Judah, saith the Lord, that they might be unto Me for a people, and for a name, and for a praise, and for a glory: but they would not hear." They neither considered the close communion with Himself into which the Almighty Father in His mercy had been pleased to bring them, nor did they reckon themselves under any particular obligation to obey His precepts. So they both despised the blessing and disregarded the duty. "I have nourished," declares their great Benefactor, "and brought up children, and they have rebelled against Me. The ox knoweth his owner, and the ass his master's crib : but Israel doth not know, my people doth not consider."

These are a few examples, which might be multiplied a thousandfold, of the method which the Divine Wisdom saw fit to employ to draw the hearts and minds of men towards their heavenly Father under the Old Covenant. Such language pervades the entire Old Testament ; all the exhortations to love and obedience proceed on the same plan ; threatening being never employed but against those who had long contemned and rejected God's goodness and mercy, such as the Jews, when our Saviour, roused to indignation by their wickedness and hypocrisy, while He pronounced their woe in the strongest possible terms, His affection almost overpowering His just wrath, exclaimed : "O Jerusalem, Jerusalem, thou that killest the prophets, and stonest them which are sent unto thee, how often would I have gathered thy children together, even as a hen gathereth her chickens under her wings, and ye would not."

Thus, by the free grace of God, or, if you please, by the predestination of God, not by works of righteousness which they themselves had done, or which God had foreseen they would do, all the children of Israel, without exception, both good and bad, worthy and unworthy, stood to God in the relation of children, whom He begot, created, made, formed ; whom He saved, bought, redeemed ; they were all His called, His chosen, His elect ; all His heritage, church, house, kingdom ; all His saints, whom He sanctified ; His vine or vineyard, which He planted ; His sheep and flock. Throughout the whole Old Testament all these honours, advantages, and relations are assigned to the entire Jewish Church without exception. Yet all these high privileges, freely conferred, did not imply an absolute, final state of happiness or favour of any kind, but were generous displays of God's unmerited love and goodness to them, which, through the assistance of the Eternal Spirit, were intended to operate as a mean, a moral and spiritual mean, upon their hearts and consciences. They were motives to oblige and excite to obedience, and were always thus employed by the Divine Donor ; and it was only when so improved that they became final and permanent blessings ; but neglected, or misimproved, they were enjoyed in vain, nay, they became "the savour of death unto death" to those on whom they were bestowed, just as the same sun which nourishes and animates the healthy, sturdy plant burns up and destroys that which is feeble and sickly. Wicked Israelites were no more the objects of God's *personal* favour than wicked heathens. In Amos ix., God, speaking of corrupt Jews, says, "Are ye not as children of the Ethiopians unto Me, O children of Israel?"

St. Paul's comment sets this whole subject in a very clear light. "Circumcision," says he, "verily profiteth, if thou keep the law ; but if thou be a breaker of the law, thy circumcision is made uncircumcision." He does not say, "Keep the law and let circumcision go ; if a man only keep the law, circumcision is unnecessary, it is no use." That is precisely the position

which he is denying. On the contrary, it is to circumcision that he ascribes the profit, and not to the keeping of the law, the keeping of the law being only the condition. His first statement is very emphatic, indeed one of the clearest and most emphatic statements in the whole Bible : "Circumcision verily profiteth." But lest this doctrine should be abused or pushed too far, as any doctrine may be, he immediately adds the restrictive clause, the condition, "if thou keep the law :" and then adds further, "but if thou be a breaker of the law, thy circumcision is made uncircumcision." Here again we see the same principle. First of all comes circumcision, the sign and seal of God's free mercy and pardoning love, bringing with it the gracious privilege of communion with God and His Church, and thus, to use St. Paul's word, profiting the recipient. But along with this great privilege comes the obligation to keep God's law, and he who, while he might even boast of God's grace and his own high privilege, failed to fulfil the obligation which that privilege entailed, thereby cut himself off from all hope of future reward, and placed himself in the position only of "that servant which knew his lord's will and did it not."

That the Jews themselves held the same doctrine on this subject is evident from many passages in the Chaldee Paraphrases, and in the Jewish writings generally. The following passage is extracted from the book "Zohar :" "At what time a man is sealed with this holy seal (of circumcision) thenceforth he seeth the holy blessed God properly, and the holy soul is united to him. If he be not worthy, and keepeth not this sign, what is written? 'By the breath of God they perish' (Job iv. 9), because this seal of the holy blessed God was not kept. But if he be worthy, and keep it, the Holy Ghost is not separated from him."

But we are no longer under circumcision and the old ceremonial law. For under the Christian dispensation, as the Apostle again tells us, "neither circumcision availeth anything, nor uncircumcision." The ceremonial law has been abolished ; the great doctrine of free justification through faith in Christ has been fully revealed ; what St. James calls the royal law of love has been more clearly manifested ; the bloody sacrifices of the Jew have given place to the more sacred ordinance of the Holy Eucharist ; circumcision has been superseded by the greater and more spiritual ordinance of Christian baptism, which is emphatically termed by St. Paul "the Circumcision of Christ," "the circumcision made without hands." Yet, though the New Covenant differs in many outward circumstances from the Old, and is abundantly more spiritual and more express, it is not essentially different. "Jesus Christ was a minister of the circumcision for the truth of God, to *confirm* the promises made unto the fathers" (Rom. xv. 8). "Christ came not to destroy, but to fulfil" (Matt. v. 17). He was "the Lamb slain from the foundation of the world." Those who were saved under the Old Covenant were saved by His grace and merits, just as men are saved under the New. The grant of mercy freely bestowed on the old church of the circumcision, was bestowed through the same Christ who is the Mediator of the New Covenant. Nay, in the Epistle to the Romans, one of the points which the author proves to the narrow, exclusive Jew is, that the Covenant of Circumcision itself was not a covenant essentially new, that the covenant under which Abraham stood before his circumcision, was really the same. Circumcision, he shows the Jew, was not a seal of any new grant, but of that same Gospel which before had been preached to Abraham, and under which he had already been justified through faith, "not in circumcision, but in uncircumcision." And how necessary such reasoning was for the ordinary Jew may be judged when we remember that it required a direct miracle to convince even the Apostle Peter himself, that any man could possibly be saved without circumcision.

That the present Christian dispensation is the Jewish scheme enlarged and perfected, may easily be seen, if we consider that we Gentiles believing in Christ, are said to be incorporated into the same body with the Jews, and that believing Jews and Gentiles are now become "one," "one flock," "one body in Christ." "Other sheep I have," says our Saviour, "which are not of this (the Jewish) fold ; them also I must bring, and they shall hear my voice, and there shall be one fold and one shepherd" (John x. 16). Abraham, the head or root of the Jewish nation, is said to be the father of us all, the father of the whole future Church, Christian as well as Jewish, as we were to be accepted after the same manner as he was, namely, by faith. For, as we are told, it was to Abraham and his seed that the promises were made. In this Abrahamic covenant were all the Jews comprehended, not only from Abraham to Moses but from Moses to Christ. For the Apostle informs us, that the covenant, that was confirmed before of God in Christ, the law (of Moses), which was four hundred and thirty years after, could not disannul that it should make the promise of none effect (Gal. iii. 17). Consequently the Jews, during the whole period of the law, or Mosaical dispensation, were under the covenant with Abraham ; and into that same covenant, the Apostle argues, the believing Gentiles are taken (Rom. iv. and Gal. iii). And for this reason he affirms (Eph. ii. 19) that they are "no more strangers and foreigners, but fellow-citizens with the saints, and of the household of God." The great mystery, he says, not understood in other ages, was this : "that the Gentiles should be fellow-heirs and of the same body" with God's Church and children, the Jews (Eph. iii. 5, 6).

Agreeably to this sentiment, the believing Gentiles are said to partake of all the spiritual privileges which the Jews enjoyed, and from which the unbelieving Jews fell (Rom. xv. 27), and to be taken into that kingdom and church of God out of which they were cast. Several of the parables of our Lord are intended to point out this fact, and many passages in the Epistles directly refer to it. Having concluded that parable known as the parable of the Wicked Husbandmen, our Saviour, addressing the Jews, declares, "Therefore I say unto you, the kingdom of God shall be taken from you, and given to a nation (the believing Gentiles) bringing forth the fruits thereof." Hence it appears that the very same kingdom of God, which the Jews once possessed, and in which the ancient prophets exercised their ministry, is that in which all we Christian Gentiles now stand ; for it was taken from them and given to us. In the eleventh of Romans the church or kingdom of God is compared to an olive-tree, and the members of it to the branches. "And," says the author, "if some of the branches (the unbelieving Jews) be broken off, and thou (the Gentile Christian), being a wild olive-tree, wert graffed in among them, and with them partakest of the root and fatness of the olive-tree." Again : "For if thou (the Gentile Christian) wert cut out of the olive-tree which is wild by nature, and wert graffed contrary to nature

into a good olive-tree." Here also the ancient Jewish Church and the present Christian Church are shown to be essentially one ; for the olive-tree, of which the Jews are represented as having been at a former time branches, is the selfsame olive-tree into which the Christian is said to be grafted.

It is upon this foundation, namely, that the believing Gentiles are taken into that Church and kingdom in which the Jews once stood, that the Apostles sometimes drew parallels, for caution and instruction, between the state of the ancient Jews and that of the Christians. Hence also the Christian Church, considered in a body, is called by the same general names as the Church under the Old Testament, such as "the Israel of God," "the Holy Jerusalem," etc. The state, membership, privileges, honours, and relations of all baptised Christians are expressed by the same phrases as those of the ancient Jewish Church. As God chose His ancient people, the Jews, and they were His chosen and elect, so now the whole body of Christians, both good and bad, without any respect whatsoever to their own works of righteousness, but by the free, unmerited grace of God in Christ, are generously admitted to the same high honour. "Not by works of righteousness which we have done, but according to His mercy He saved us, by the washing of regeneration, and renewing of the Holy Ghost ; which He shed on us abundantly through Jesus Christ our Saviour ; that being justified by His grace, we should be made heirs according to the hope of eternal life" (Tit. iii. 5, 6, 7).

Thus *all* the professing Christians at Rome, without distinction, were declared by St. Paul to be baptised into Jesus Christ ; *all* baptised into His death ; *all* buried with Him by baptism into death ; *all* planted together in the likeness of His death (Rom. vi). And all this independently of their moral character and Christian experience, for St. Paul, having never been at Rome at the time of his writing thus, could have had no particular knowledge of either. These were common privileges of the baptised state, of all, "so many as were baptised" (ver. 3). But linked with the common privilege, there was the common duty to "walk in newness of life" (ver. 4). In the same way he addresses them all indiscriminately as being "called of Jesus Christ," "beloved of God," "called (or constituted) saints," as "justified by faith and having peace with God," as "standing in the grace of the Gospel," as "alive from the dead." All his exhortations and warnings are common : "Let not sin reign in your mortal body" ; "Yield yourselves unto God" ; "I beseech you, therefore, brethren, by the *mercies* of God, that ye present your bodies a living sacrifice, holy, acceptable unto God, which is your reasonable service" ; "We shall all stand before the judgment-seat of Christ" ; "Every one of us shall give account of himself to God" ; "It is high time to awake out of sleep" ; "Let us therefore cast off the works of darkness" ; "Let us not walk in rioting and drunkenness, in clambering and wantonness, in strife and envying ;" "Make not provision for the flesh to fulfil the lusts thereof" ; "For if ye live after the flesh, ye shall die : but if ye through the Spirit do mortify the deeds of the body, ye shall live."

Such is the plan of all the Apostolic Epistles. Precisely the same strong "Church" principle pervades them, which runs throughout the Old Testament Scriptures. Indeed, in the New Testament, the principle is intensified. The Corinthian Church, which contained many even open sinners, the Apostle most emphatically calls "the temple of God." "Know ye not," says he, "that ye are the temple of God, and that the Spirit of God dwelleth in you" (1 Cor. iii. 16). "Ye are the body of Christ" (xii. 27), he says to the same people, without any qualification whatever. He reminds them, that by one Spirit they were *all* baptised into one body, whether they were Jews or Gentiles, whether they were bond or free, and had been *all* made to drink into one Spirit (xii. 13). The cup of blessing which they blessed was the communion of the blood of Christ ; the bread which they broke was the Communion of the body of Christ. They, being many, were one bread, one body, for they were *all* partakers of that one bread (x. 16, 17). They had *all* passed through the Red Sea of Christian baptism ; they *all* ate the same spiritual meat, they *all* drank the same spiritual drink, they *all* drank of that spiritual Rock that followed them, and that Rock was Christ (x. 1-4). St. Paul considered himself as a Christian teacher, bound to impress upon their minds and memories all the graces and privileges of their position as well as its duties and obligations, just as in both his letters to Timothy he considered it his duty to put that ecclesiastic in remembrance to stir up the gift of God, which was in him by the putting on of his hands. Thus God, guiding the pen of the Apostle, sought to draw these Corinthians to their duty "with cords of a man, and with the bands of love" (Hos. xi. 4).

The Epistle to the Galatians furnishes another example, perhaps still more distinct, of the same method. But it is needless to trace the matter further. By the predestination and election of God, by His free grace in Christ, all baptised Christians, without exception, both good and bad, worthy and unworthy, were and are constituted God's people, church, nation, heritage ; His children, spouse, flock, vineyard ; of all whom He is the God, King, Saviour, Father, Husband, Shepherd ; all of whom He created, saved, bought, redeemed, begot, made, planted ; who are all the seed of Abraham, and heirs according to the promise ; who are all under grace, and all partakers of the root and fatness of the good olive tree, the Christian Covenant. All these high privileges, honours, and relations, are conferred, through the merits and atoning sacrifice of the incarnate Son of God, as freely and as liberally as the water which has been divinely appointed as their sign, and are realised and apprehended on man's part by faith. These are "the things that are freely given to us of God," as St. Paul says. Yet all these vast blessings, as they are assigned to the whole body of baptised Christians, no more imply an absolute, final state of salvation than the similar blessings did in the case of the ancient Jews. On the firm foundation of all this free grace, made sure to the whole fallen race of Adam by the sacrifice of Christ's death, *consequent* exhortations to love and obedience are, throughout the entire New Testament, addressed to the whole body of Christians, just as exhortations to love and obedience are, throughout the Old Testament, addressed to the whole body of Jews. Christianity has not freed men from obedience to the moral law. On the other hand, the moral law is binding on Christians in a fuller and more spiritual sense than ever it was on those under the Old Covenant. Therefore, though we, as baptised Christians, persons "baptised into Jesus Christ," "baptised into His death," may by mere faith claim all the blessings of the Christian covenant—nay, are bound so to claim them, we must not, as the ancient Jews

often did, forget our consequent obligations, our obligation to "walk in newness of life," to "mortify the deeds of the body," to "work out our own salvation"; else our Christian circumcision, our baptism into Christ, will become uncircumcision. Though, as baptised Christians, we are bound to acknowledge and claim by mere faith that we have crossed the Red Sea in our journey toward the "heavenly" Canaan, yet we must not be ignorant that the majority of those who passed over that sea which typified our Christian baptism, were overthrown in the wilderness. "These things," the inspired writer says, "happened unto them for examples, and are written for our admonition."

It is this broad and liberal "church" principle of Scripture which gives to the theology of the Bible that peculiarly healthy and hopeful tone which distinguishes it so clearly from the dangerous and fanatical individualism of the Puritan, and from the no less dangerous and fanatical superstition of the Romanist. Yet this "church" principle is not the substance of the Gospel, but its Divine form, plan, or outline, which, however, let it be distinctly stated, could never, in and by itself, "take away sin," nor satisfy the needs of the human soul. Τὸ δὲ σῶμα Χριστοῦ (Col. ii. 17). If there are any people in the world, as it is said there are, who regard the sacraments of the Church as of the nature of a charm, as a kind of substitute for a present Christ, or for the bounden Christian duties of faith, hope, and love, it would be difficult to mention a more stupid misconception or a more dangerous error. As the supernatural cloud visibly indicated the presence and providence of Christ to the "Church in the wilderness," so do the Christian sacraments, which are equally supernatural in their origin and character, indicate under the Gospel the universal and abiding presence and love of Him in whom "dwelleth all the fullness of the Godhead bodily." Such is the natural inference from a candid review of the tenth and eleventh chapters of 1 Corinthians. The design of the sacraments therefore, cannot be to supply the place of any Christian duty whatever, but is, on the other hand, to bring men into closer and more sensible "communion" with Christ, and to inspire all with a more direct, more intense, more saving, more realising faith in the eternal, omnipresent, ever-present God-Man, "in whom we have redemption through His blood, even the forgiveness of sins" (Col. i. 14).

The Scriptural mode of presenting Divine truth, to which it has been the object of this paper humbly to invite attention, it may be remarked, is neither the Calvinistic, nor the Arminian, nor even the "High-Church" mode. Its peculiarity and its glory is that it unites the excellencies and the advantages of all these systems, whilst their faults are conspicuous only by their absence. Hence the fact that the Anglican Church, in all her authoritative documents, observes so faithfully the Bible method of teaching, leads many even among those of the highest education to think, with Lord Macaulay, that our theology is altogether inconsistent with itself, and that it is made up, as that philosopher expresses it, of "a bundle of religious systems without number"! This mistaken notion was never more prevalent than at the present time, and the most serious part of the matter is that the impression is strongly encouraged by ingenious men of different parties, whose sentiments and purposes violently conflict, and who contemplate radical changes in opposite directions. The circle of religious opinion in our country seems ever widening. In what will this state of things issue? Indeed, what is to be the future of the English race ecclesiastically is, from many standpoints, one of the most important and far-reaching questions of the age. If we are to be saved from superstition and tyranny on the one hand, and from heresy, schism, and disruption on the other, that deliverance can be effected only by a quiet and cordial union of all honest, loyal, and sober-minded men of all parties. Persons of this description constitute, let it be presumed, the great majority of our clergy and influential laity. But at present such men have no common ecclesiastical object, no common bond of union, nothing to merge them into one common party. Hence arise, owing to diversity of ideals, so many of our childish and ridiculous squabbles. Might it not tend, to a great extent, to solve difficulties, to heal wounds, and altogether to induce a more satisfactory tone, if the loyal and earnest clergy of the different schools of thought, quite abandoning one-sided systems and unnatural developments, would draw on all sides as closely as possible towards the common Scriptural centre, would approach as nearly as possible to that method of instruction which is so clearly exhibited in the apostolic Epistles, which was the method of the early Fathers, which was the method of the Catholic Church in all ages, except so far as it was abused, perverted, and overlaid by ignorance and priestcraft, which was restored to its original dignity by the Anglican Reformers, and which is at once manly, simple, and philosophic. A sufficiently strong movement in so wholesome a direction, towards the promotion of which it is likewise within the power of our leading laymen to contribute in no small degree, must have the effect of bringing all parties to realise more deeply what the Apostles were so solicitous to keep impressed on the minds of their flocks, namely, the great fact of the union of the whole Church in Christ. So shall we be "no longer children, tossed to and fro," but shall "all attain unto the unity of the faith, and of the knowledge of the Son of God, unto a full grown man, unto the measure of the stature of the fulness of Christ."

R. T. ARMSTRONG.

Osborne Terrace, Warrenpoint.

CORRESPONDENCE.

To the Editor of the CHURCH OF ENGLAND PULPIT AND ECCLESIASTICAL REVIEW.

SUPRALAPSARIANS AND SUBLAPSARIANS.

SIR,—As Mr. Hogg's use of these terms, in his paper on "Divine Eclecticism" in your current issue, seems to show that he has forgotten or overlooked their meaning, it may be of use to remind your readers that they referred to the relation between the Divine predestination and the fall (*lapsus*) of man. In the Reformed Churches of the seventeenth century there were Calvinists and Calvinists. The more rigid, who held that God decreed the Fall and made it inevitable by His sovereign power, were called Supralapsarians, as carrying back the action of God's absolute predestination so as to include man's original probation; while Sublapsarian was applied to those who held that God only permitted and foresaw the Fall, and that His predestinating decree was limited to determining who out of the fallen race should be saved, and who left to perish eternally.

How thankful we have reason to be that such uncouth terms and barren discussions are as dead as the monsters of the Palæozoic Age!

BROWNLOW MAITLAND.

THE KINGDOM OF GOD AND OF HEAVEN.

SIR,—'Student," with a view to making out his case of there being a difference between the two expressions, "the kingdom of God" and "the kingdom of heaven"—the former meaning the "Communion of Saints" and the latter "the Catholic Church"—or rather, perhaps I should say, with a view to meeting any main argument for their identity, puts forward the rather desperate argument that St. Luke was less accurate in his report of our Lord's sayings than St. Matthew, and that had he been quite accurate he would have spoken only of "the kingdom of heaven," like St. Matthew, avoiding the inaccurate expression "the kingdom of God." The credit of "Student's" new-fangled distinctions, must be saved at the expense of St. Luke's long and well-established reputation for accuracy. In fact St. Luke, according to "Student," ought to write his preface over again, leaving out the word "accurately" (ἀκριβῶς) from it. His informants have misled him into supposing that our Lord sent His Apostles to preach "the kingdom of God," which means "the Communion of Saints," whereas He really sent them to preach quite a different thing, viz., "the kingdom of heaven," which means "the Catholic Church." Of course St. Mark—that other inspired (?) evangelist—who is generally supposed to have had his information from that other "eye and ear-witness" St. Peter, falls under the same condemnation. For my part I am glad to think that both these inspired prophets of Christ are unjustly condemned by "Student," inasmuch as I can say, now that I have all his letters before me, that he has not advanced a single reason for supposing that there is the slightest difference in meaning between "the kingdom of heaven" as mentioned in St. Matthew, and "the kingdom of God" as mentioned in St. Mark, St. Luke, and St. John. If I am wrong here I shall be glad if "Student" will give us his reason or reasons in his next letter. Of course he will not put his *assertion* that "the kingdom of heaven is the Catholic Church: the kingdom of God is the Communion of Saints" in place of a *reason*. That assertion of his is the very thing that is in question, and that wants proving badly. Meantime we may go on believing—what I imagine has been universally believed from the Apostles' days till now—that the two expressions mean one and the same kingdom, just as if one man were to speak of "the Queen's Empire" in India and another of the "British Empire" there.

I wish he would also tell us what bearing his second paragraph in his letter of to-day has upon the subject in question, especially how his explanation of the two parables of the mustard-seed and the leaven fails to fit the kingdom of God or of heaven as I understand it. I had expected, in response to my last letter, an explanation of his mysterious distinction between the first, fifth, and sixth parables in Matt. xiii. and the other four. I did not expect that he would give us instead a very common place explanation of the third and fourth, and the difference between them.

He "does not know what eminent authorities" say that the Catholic Church means "all true Christians" rather than "all who profess and call themselves Christians." That is very likely. Well, I will mention for his information a few out of many such. Clement of Alexandria, says, "I call the Church the aggregate (ἀθροισμα) of the elect." "The true Church, that which is really ancient, is one, and in it those are enrolled who are righteous according to the purpose of God. . . . . Therefore, in substance and idea, in origin, in pre-eminence, we say that the ancient and Catholic Church stands by itself, collecting as it does into the unity of the one faith . . . . those already ordained, whom God predestinated, knowing before the foundation of the world that they would be righteous." Augustine, of Hippo, says: "I dare not understand the true Church to consist of any but the holy and the righteous." "There are many who are with the Church in the partaking of its sacraments, and are not in the Church." Pope Gregory the Great says: "Within the limits of the Church are all the elect; without it are the reprobate, because the holy Church against which the gates of Hades shall not prevail consisteth of the elect unto life eternal." Our own Bishop Morton, in his "Catholic Appeal," tells us that the Venerable Bede also applied the title "Catholic Church" "to the society of the elect only.' The Bishop himself remarks, alluding more particularly to Cardinal Bellarmine, that "Some of our adversaries, to take away the distinction of visible and invisible Church, have so conceited of 'the Catholic Church,' the article of Christian belief, as to think that wicked men and limbs of Satan may be true members of this mystical body of Christ, even for their outward profession's sake. We (of the Church of England) contrariwise teach, that those glorious titles of Spouse of Christ and Catholic Church do properly appertain unto the faithful and elect of God." Perhaps "Student" will write a little more respectfully in future of what has been held in all ages, and by the very highest authorities, such as those I have mentioned, about "the Catholic Church." I suppose he does believe there is such a body as consists only of all true Christians, called in our Catechism "the elect people of God." The question is whether that body—the wheat in the kingdom field, as distinct from the tares—is not more worthy of the title, "the holy Catholic Church," than, as Bellarmine maintains, a body that includes "reprobates and notorious sinners" among its members—the tares as well as the wheat in the field. For my part, I do not think such a Catholic Church as Bellarmine and "Student" "conceit of" is worth believing in by any Christian man. Of course all the infidels in Christendom, as well as all the devils, believe in it as a very palpable fact; but that hardly qualifies it as an article of the Christian faith.

I may remark, however, that his "conceit" of the Catholic Church and mine of the kingdom of heaven and of God, in its present phase of existence, exactly correspond, so that we are quite agreed as to what the kingdom of heaven is. Only I believe that it is also the kingdom of God, and is not, properly speaking, the Catholic Church.

He says, in conclusion, "The Communion of Saints is not an organism that is anywhere in Scripture spoken of as such." But who ever said it was? Not I, for certain.

January 28th, 1893. W. T. HOBSON.

P.S.—It might throw some light on our subject if "Student" would consider and tell us if we are to make a further distinction between "the kingdom of Christ," according to Christ Himself, St. Paul, and the penitent malefactor, and "the kingdom of heaven"

and "the kingdom of God." If "the kingdom of Christ" is something by itself, and, if so, what is it? If not, is it identical with "the kingdom of heaven" or with "the kingdom of God?"

W. T. H.

PREFERMENTS AND APPOINTMENTS.

Almack, Rev. William, M.A.; Vicar of Ospringe, Kent.
Askwith, Rev. Edward Harrison, M.A., formerly Assistant-Master at Westminster School; Vicar of St. Michael's, Cambridge.
Bird, Rev. Clement, M.A., Minor Canon of Chester Cathedral; Licensed to officiate in the Diocese of Chester.
Bird, Rev. George; Vicar of St. Barnabas's, Bradwell, Derbyshire.
Blythe, Rev. W. E., M.A.; Chaplain of St. George's Hospital, London.
Brandon, Rev. Andrew O'Brien, M.A.; Vicar of St. Paul's, Tottenham.
Browne, Rev. G. F., B.D., Canon of St. Paul's Cathedral; Secretary to the London Diocesan Home Mission.
Coleman, Rev. G. W., M.A., Vicar of St. John's, Great Marsden, Nelson; Vicar of St. Augustine's, Tong Moor, near Bolton.
Cunningham, Rev. W. L., Vicar of St. Philip's, Newcastle; Vicar of St. Augustine's, North Shields.
Cutlack, Rev. Llewelyn Charles, B.A., Curate; Rector of Newbold, Chesterfield.
Frith, Rev. W. E. C.; Vicar of St. Aidan's, Herrington, near Fence Houses.
Gray, Rev. Andrew, E. P., M.A., F.S.A., Rector of Wallasey, and Lecturer at St. Aidan's Theological College; Assistant Commissary to the Bishop of Mashonaland.
Hibbert, Rev. J. A. N., M.A., Curate of Christ Church, Harpurhey; Rector of St. Andrew's, Blackley, Manchester.
Hume-Smith, Rev. F. G., M.A., Vicar of Armley; Honorary Canon of Ripon Cathedral.
Hunt, Rev. P. L., M.A., Assistant Chaplain and Master; Chaplain at Blundell's School, Tiverton.
Jameson, Rev. Arthur J., M.A., Curate of Runcorn; Curate-in-Charge of St. Michael's Mission District.
Jenkyn, Rev. John L., Precentor of Liverpool Cathedral; Surrogate for the Diocese of Liverpool.
Kirkby, Rev. John Henry, M.A.; Vicar of Weston-on-the-Green, Oxon.
Lamb, Rev. A. H.; Perpetual Curate of Ford, Herefordshire.
McGowan, Rev. Willie, M.A.; Rector of Nevendon, Essex.
Macnamara, Rev. Henry Danvers, M.A., Minor Canon of St. Paul's; Rector of St. James's, Garlickhithe, in the City of London.
May, Rev. T. H., M.A., Rector of Heswall; Surrogate for the Diocese of Chester.
Morgan, Rev. E. J.; Rector of Aldrington, Sussex.
Nanson, Rev. Robert V.; Vicar of Manningtree, Essex.
Pugh, Rev. George Augustus, M.A., Vicar of Swindon Dudley; Rector of Ashton-under-Lyne.
Ram, Rev. Stephen A. S., M.A., Curate of Holy Trinity, Bolton-le-Sands; Assistant Diocesan Inspector of Church Day-schools in the South-Eastern Division of the Diocese of Manchester.
Seaton, Rev. Douglas, M.A., Vicar of Goodrich; Prebendary of Bartonsham, in Hereford Cathedral.
Smythies, Rev. William Yorick, M.A.; Vicar of West Mersea, Essex.

CLERICAL OBITUARY.

Green, Rev. Archer, M.A., late Fellow of Christ's College, Cambridge, at 4, St. Julian's-road, Kilburn, on January 22nd, aged 35.
Hawkins, Rev. Charles, B.C.L., late Vicar of Oakley, at 9, Wellington-square, Cheltenham, on January 26th, aged 73.
Lawson, Rev. William L., late Rector of Lynton, North Devon, at Capri, Italy, on January 26th, aged 68.
Paynter, Rev. Samuel, M.A., at 4, Marlborough-gate, Hyde Park, on January 22nd, aged 91.
Smith, Rev. Frederick, at Trinity Vicarage, Fareham, on January 27th, aged 75.

FIRST REMOVE THE CAUSE.

MEN frequently worry and trouble themselves a great deal in trying to cure the symptoms of vital weakness nervous exhaustion, and kindred ailments, instead of endeavouring to first remove the cause. This can be done by Mr. Harness' Electropathic Treatment without the aid of drugs. It is useless to tell sufferers to employ their minds and bodies in useful work and to forget their disorders, so long as the cause of their troubles is not removed. How can it be expected that when they are fatigued by the least exertion they can occupy themselves by studying, walking, or other exercise? Even in conversation they frequently lose the thread of it and repeatedly find their memory failing them. What can they do? Physic will not cure them—perhaps the leading physicians have fallen to afford them any relief, and they have consequently become hopeless. It is to such as these that Mr. Harness' new combined Electropathic Belt and Suspensory is so strongly recommended, as, by its gentle but continuous action, invigorating electric currents are imperceptibly generated and conveyed direct from the spinal cord to the affected parts. It is this scientifically constructed and convenient appliance which silently but surely acts upon the vital organs, and removes the cause of the patient's disease, effecting a wonderful change in his health, character, and conduct, and speedily enabling him to return to his natural tastes and habits, and enjoy once more the full vigour of youth, with all its accompanying pleasures.

We may add that this perfect Electro-medical appliance is exceedingly comfortable to wear, gives wonderful support and vitality to all the internal organs of the body, prevents chills, imparts new life and vigour to the debilitated constitution, stimulates the organic action, promotes the circulation, assists digestion, and promptly renews that vital energy, the loss of which is the first symptom of decay. Its healing properties are multifarious. It stimulates the functions of various organs, increases their secretions, gives tone to muscle and nerves, relaxes morbid contractions, improves nutrition, and effectually renews exhausted nerve force. Acting directly on the system, it sustains and assists its various functions, and thus promotes the health and vigour of the entire frame. Besides these benefits, the mind is maintained in a buoyant, cheerful state, and every faculty is stimulated to the highest condition of intellectual strength.

Gentlemen who read the above announcement have only to visit London and call at the Electropathic and Zander Institute (52, Oxford Street, W.) to be convinced of the marvellous curative powers of Electricity and Mr. Harness' perfect methods of imperceptibly applying the current. The medical officers of the establishment are in daily attendance, and may by consulted free of charge either personally or by letter.

The Church of England Pulpit.

THE SECRET OF UNSELFISHNESS.

By the Ven. WILLIAM MACDONALD SINCLAIR, D.D, Archdeacon of London, Canon of St. Paul's, Examining Chaplain to the Bishop of London, and Hon. Chaplain to H.M. the Queen.

Sermon Preached before the University of Cambridge, on Sunday, January 22nd, 1893.

"Be of good courage, and let us behave ourselves valiantly for our people, and for the cities of our God; and let the Lord do that which is good in His sight."—1 Chron. xix. 13.

THERE is a difference between University life and that which is outside; not because the world is not here, as it is everywhere, but because you form a society of your own, with distinct objects and marked characteristics which are in themselves a safeguard against lower and less abstract pursuits. It would be interesting to you, my younger brothers, if, after an absence of twenty years from all the blended associations which help to make up your existence in this place, you should have returned to it with the accumulated impressions of the hard and ceaseless struggles of the world outside. Many of the ideals which you had properly formed in the society of high and pure thinkers would have received rude and serious shakes. When we have first been drinking from the fountain of learning and philosophical speculation it is common to most of us, I think, to feel the impulse of a chivalrous zeal for redressing wrongs, a strong hopefulness that we may be useful and effective in the world, a golden belief that, if people would only listen to us, many things would be better than they are. "The true spirit of chivalry is a generous impatience of wrong, an active sympathy with the oppressed, an unquenchable fury against the oppressor, a general protection of the weak against the guilty and the powerful;" and there is much of it left in our day. Most of us probably have had our own ideals, some of them nobler than others. As we look out into the great field of the world's action the way to improvement seems to us when we are as yet undisappointed wonderfully clear. Certain things need to be said, or to be done, and then everybody will fall into line, and the great people of whom we are units will go forward with gladness and renewed strength. We look forth from our castle walls in the brightness of our youth on the vast mass of toiling and sorrowing men and women in the crowded city outside, and the buoyancy of our spirit makes everything smile like a sweet spring morning. There they are in their ignorance and stupidity following the false object, doing the wrong thing, thinking the foolish thought; and we can make them happy and wise. Whether our thoughts be towards the political, the social, the moral, or the religious, we have learnt it all; it is fresh in our minds; we have been initiated into the treasure of wisdom and are ready to tell the world just what it ought to know.

Alas! when we have been down in the thick of the press, we find the grim truth of the words of the sage, "that ideals can never be completely embodied in practice. Ideals must ever lie a great way off, and we will thankfully content ourselves with any not intolerable approximation thereto." In spite of the advance of God's kingdom, the world is, as it always has been, much more wickedly perverse than we ever supposed possible. It astonishes us by its unreasonableness. Its evil is not merely the self-abandonment of lasciviousness, which once seemed to us the measure of that which is worst; but it is its hard grasping selfishness that strikes us, its freezing sneering indifference, its scorn of sympathy, its cruel and deliberate cultivation of cynicism, its wilful blindness where it does not choose to see. The din is greater than we expected, and our little voices are hardly heard. And there are others with their plans, different from ours, all competing for recognition; the Positivist, the Materialist, the Socialist, the Romanist, the Liberationist, the Agnostic, the agitator, the revolutionist. More they are than could be named, and they are all in earnest, and they do not care a snap for us and our aspirations. We all discover that we can do less than we hoped. Life has, indeed, wonderfully more than we calculated in the infinite variety of its experiences; but ah! how much less than we imagined in its achievements and performances!

And ought we, therefore, to lose our confidence of determination, our directness of aim, our zeal of activity? Have we any right to falter and hang back, and to harbour the lurking suspicion that our labour is in vain, and that we are fools not to indulge ourselves with the selfishness of the world? My brothers, the message which I have ventured in all humility and diffidence and self-reproach to take upon myself the enormous privilege of coming here to offer you to-day is the very reverse. It is true, indeed, that for our spiritual good the Almighty Being has to teach to each of us the lesson that of us individually He has no need, and that, if our earthly existence should cease tomorrow, He has others ready who would take our place in the ranks, who would do our work far better than we, so that we should never be missed. But it is no less certain that the cause to which we, as Christians, have devoted ourselves is beyond all

measurement the strongest and best force in our contemporary life, combining in itself all that is anywhere true and good. The world is not yet converted from its poor, imperfect, foolish, sinful ways; but, for all that, it is simply the plain scientific fact that it is our Lord who is moulding more thoroughly than ever before the best life of the country. We have no reason whatever to suppose that before the end comes there will ever be a time on earth when the majority of men in any of the nations will have submitted to the yoke of Christ. It should be great matter for rejoicing to us that there are enough in our day to be the salt of the earth and the light of the world. And that is probably now more the case than it was at any time in the past. It is our Lord who has given us the ideal of personal purity, the ideal of the dignity of marriage, the beauty of home life. It is our Lord who has set free the slave, as it was promised that He should; He has abolished the old licentious and brutal sports which were once the joy of civilisation, and has taught us the dignity of even the humblest labour. Not only in His kingdom, but wherever the influence of His sway is felt, the neglect and exposure of children is impossible. Their position in the human family has been wholly changed; "their angels do always behold the face of My Father which is in heaven." It is our Lord who has infused the principle of humanity into law, discouraged the madness of warfare, and prepared the way for peaceful and judicious arbitration. It is He who has bestowed on mankind the gift of the true Liberty, the true Equality, the true Brotherhood. By teaching the principle of stewardship to God for every possession, He has given us the real cure for the disproportions which startle us in the distribution of wealth. By impressing us with the importance of every human soul, and the need of self-respect, prudence, and personal effort, He has discountenanced pauperism. If the basest forms of vice are not yet absolutely forgotten, He has made them hide in dark and hateful lairs of secrecy. Before His glorious arm and flaming sword personal feuds and private wars have disappeared, and wager of battle, and ordeal, and the duel; torture is fled, and wrecking, and piracy. He it is to Whom the world owes the benignant rest of the first day, the cleansing of the prisons, the humanisation of punishments, the thought of the rights of animals, the crusade against intemperance, impurity, gambling, and every kind of degradation. It is our Lord Who builds every one of our countless hospitals and asylums, Who provides for the widow, the fatherless, and the stranger, Who is making the deaf hear, and the dumb speak, and the lame to leap, and the foul to be cleansed, and the ignorant to grasp the power of knowledge, and the idiot to have some glimmer of hope, and the harlot to be exorcised, and the deformed and despicable to be treated with honour and pity. In every one of those innumerable philanthropic agencies which are the glory of our age, it is the inspiration of our Lord that is the motive-power. In His name we claim justice and truth, and self-sacrifice, and public spirit, and purity in public life as well as in private; under His sanction we rebuke dishonour, falsehood, prevarication, crookedness and corruption in our public men. In spite of the dead selfishness of the world, and its tendency constantly to relapse, never probably was benevolence so active, earnest, and discriminating; never were ideals so lofty and intelligent. And we, as the sworn servants of Christ, whatever obstacles we may find in the way of working out our own schemes—and good is it for us that those obstacles should be there—can indeed rejoice greatly, and lift up our heads and thank the Lord of all Lords; for His mercy endureth for ever! Whatever may be the issue of our narrow personal ideals, we can say with absolute trust, "Let the Lord do that which is good in His sight!"

Amongst all the puzzles and perplexities and personal failures which are inseparable from that imperfect and tentative condition of fallen humanity in which we find ourselves, it is not too much to say, as a matter of positive experience, that to us, as long as we are true to the simple faith and example of our Lord, every day brings inestimable happiness and satisfaction. And those divine blessings, the purest that man can enjoy, are all the more real because they are unsought. Of all the aids to faith the witness of our own conscience is, perhaps, the most powerful; but it is not so much of faith that I wish to speak to you to-day as of the conduct of life.

"If any man will do the will of God, he shall know of the doctrine." The great word that our Lord has for each and all of us is Unselfishness. It is abrogation of self in aim, ambition, purpose, thought, and daily practice; in things great as well as things small. It is an old lesson, but it is ever fresh because by nature we are sure to refuse it, and to the world it is absolutely repugnant. It is there that lies the secret of the world's failure; it is there that shines forth the undying vitality of our Lord and His Cross. Unless you can teach this paramount truth to your youth at your public schools, your education is largely thrown away. He becomes hard, cynical, self-indulgent, a lover of pleasure, an unscrupulous votary of amusement, a slave of fashion, feverishly athirst for excitement. All sin is selfishness. Wherever our highest class devotes itself to voluptuousness and forgets its lofty duties, its incalculable opportunities, it is selfishness that is the poison at work. Wherever the middle class shows its materialism and vulgarization, its scorn of noble thought and high generosity, it is because it has never learned the divine attraction of Him who pleased not Himself. Wherever the lower class is brutal, impatient, coarse, grasping, intemperate, uncontrolled, it is because they have never given a thought to the

meaning of the life of Him who took upon Him the form of a servant, and spent His whole life in going about doing good. Wherever politicians are reckless in aim and crooked in method, it is because they have never realised that the true kingdom is not of this world, that a man's life consisteth not in the abundance of the things that he possesseth, and that righteousness, justice, temperance, honesty, and unity are the best policy for any people. Wherever parties rage each against the other, and snatch advantages, and exult in victories, and breed disunion, it is because they have never understood that our Lord will never agree to be confined and limited, so that men should be able to say, "Lo here!" or "Lo there!" but His kingdom is within us, in our hearts and in our lives.

From the mistakes and follies, the false ideals and rash judgments, the misspent energies and misguided enthusiasms of the world, we turn with relief to the calm and dispassionate life of a great Christian University. If the younger of my hearers are filled, as is the prerogative of their age, with generous and untried impulses, the elder have something of that knowledge and experience of the world which I have suggested, but which, while it brings sobriety and sometimes sadness, adds the great gift of wisdom. It is the combination of both which in a sphere primarily devoted to learning is the invaluable contribution that you are making to the national well-being. Here you can inculcate and practice that serene moderation in temper without which controversy becomes mere vulgar jangling, and politics the wretched pursuit of personal ends. "In any controversy, the instant we feel angry, we have already ceased striving for truth and begun striving for ourselves." Here, while outside few are strong enough to resist the worship of wealth and the passion for display, you can hold up to the nation the exalted example of unworldliness in life, of days sufficiently interesting without the excitements of dissipation, of respect not for birth in itself, nor for any mere personal advantage, but for supremacy in intellect and virtue. Here you can promote that thoroughness of research into things practical and theoretical which is a perpetual rebuke to the superficiality, the hastiness, the emptiness and impetuosity of the world. And instead of being content to take a mere utilitarian advantage of the passing opportunities, or with lines of conduct that are second best or even third, mere shabby shifts and lazy submissions to expedience, it is your high function in all things to uphold the ideal, and never to rest satisfied with anything short of the highest perfection attainable.

Such seems to us who are away the charm and the function of University life. And if from the recollection of my own experience I may venture to offer to those who are still under education an application of these principles of unselfishness, I would say to you, my brothers, what is often very difficult for you to remember in the manifold machinery of reasonable and delightful but unnecessary occupations that surround you, that the one form of self-denial which is imperatively desirable for you is thoroughness of preparation for that sphere of life, whatever it may be, to which you will be afterwards called. Opportunities for every other kind of pursuit will recur again and again through life; these few priceless years of mental discipline and equipment will never return. The future of each of you is of more importance than you suspect; if you do not store your mind here with all that can be taught you, that future will be maimed and marred. The time will soon be upon you when the monotonous details of business or the engrossing preoccupations of social engagements will swathe you round with a thousand petty bonds, and you will lament in vain for those golden hours which were offered you for real, deep, untransitory study. Do not allow even the spell of comradeship to invade this the first and best of all your privileges. Let no eagerness for actuality persuade you to anticipate practical life in things pastoral, social, or political; be patient, self-controlled, self-denying. A day will come when all these things will be your duty. Your duty now is the laying of the most solid foundation for the future that is possible to your capacities. So best can you serve your country.

Then, when you leave these quiet scenes, how different will be your activities! It is sometimes said that now that the most unlettered of the people have in their hands the whole semblance of political power, the function of the educated classes will be gone. Prophecies are made that the democracy, as it gradually awakes to its apparently unlimited possibilities, will destroy the existing system, overthrow the institutions of the Christian religion, and work out for itself the bare morality of a hard and hopeless materialism. Never were prognostications more false or faithless. Power does not reside in multiplicity of votes, but in the force of truth. The counting of heads is not the estimate of brains. The hundreds of thousands of the working people, with all their merits and hopes, have little scope for independent study and thought. They are peculiarly susceptible to the impressions of genius, and ready to be led by those who have intelligence superior to their own, and who are masters of their subjects. It is here that the opportunity waits for educated men who are fired by unselfish love of their country. Probably never before were there so many questions to be settled which need trained thought and patient investigation. There are all the challenges which have been given in the relations of labour and capital; conflicting theories of education; the painful phenomena of overcrowding in great cities; possibilities of colonization; the social life of the poor; the difficulties of the free immigration of

foreign paupers; the rivalry between Trades Union and free labour; the seductive fallacies of Socialism; the extinction or mitigation of pauperism; the best means of promotiug thrift and temperance—all these questions are enough to absorb the best energies of the wisest, most patient, most zealous, and most unselfish of patriots. And to those to whom matters ecclesiastical present attraction the present epoch offers a sufficient array of important problems; the definition of the Church, the meaning of the word Catholic, the extent and limits of the authority of the Church, its relation to the written word, its adaptation to the wants of the people, its importance as a principle of national union, its function in promoting mutual understanding amongst different bodies of Christians, its perpetual protest against error and bigotry, its ceaseless desire for conciliation, the interpretation of its true spirit, its uncompromising war against intolerance and superstition—these are surely points which will one day deserve your closest attention, your most self-denying devotions.

"Let us behave ourselves valiantly for our people!" My brothers the call is indisputable, the opportunity unprecedented, the reward immeasurable. Great are the works which our Lord has done for us in the days of which our fathers have told us, and in the old time before them. We have found His word the truest of all messages to our own souls. He is gone into the spiritual world, the world of reality, and we see Him at present no more; but we know Him of a truth in countless ways to be the Head of His Church, in Whom the whole body, fitly framed and knit together, through that which every joint supplieth, according to the working in due measure of each several part, maketh the increase of the body with the building up of itself in love. He has given us this true secret of happiness in unselfish love of the brethren. Oh, you who have the privilege of being on the highest level of our Christian civilisation, by the fulfilment of the purpose of your own lives, by your desire of daily peace, by all your generous instincts, by the glorious past of your country, by the multitudinous necessities of her ever-increasing greatness, by your loyalty to your Master, I call upon you to rise to the highest ideal of unselfishness, and devote all your powers and energies to the good of our people!

THE Council of Selwyn College have determined to begin the building of a permanent chapel, from designs by Sir A. Blomfield, A.R.A. The necessary funds have been raised by private contributions, including £3,000 from the Rev. T. H. Orpen, tutor of the college; £1,000 from Mr. R. L. Tooth; and £2,000 from past and present members of the college. But the amount raised will only just suffice for the fabric, and it is hoped that further contributions will be made to enable the council to complete the fittings and the decoration of the chapel by the time that the building is erected.

NOTICES.

All communications respecting the Literary portion of the paper should be addressed to the Editor.

Business communications of every kind should be addressed to Mr. S. GIBBON, at the CHURCH OF ENGLAND PULPIT Office, 160, Fleet Street, London, E.C., to whom cheques and Post-office orders for subscriptions (in advance), three months, 2s., six months, 3s. 6d., twelve months, 6s. 6d., are to be made payable.

The Cases for binding Vol. XXXIV. are now ready.

FOR HEALTH AND IMMORTALITY.

The Ecclesiastical Review.

SATURDAY, FEBRUARY 11, 1893.

A WELSH RARE-BIT.

MR. GLADSTONE and his Government appear to have gone in regularly for the penny-in-the-slot business. Whatever faction you belong to, you have only to drop your copper into the old Parliamentary Hand, and you will be immediately provided with whatever portion you most covet of your neighbour's property at the least possible trouble and expense to yourself.

The Welsh Members of Parliament appear to have made this discovery—later, it is true, than the Irish; but still not too late to turn it to good purpose. It may be remembered that, during the General Election, Mr. Gladstone was deeply impressed with the iniquitous character of the Establishment of the Church in Wales, and positively panted to give effect to the pious aspirations of those Welshmen who longed to finger the tithes themselves. After the election was over that enthusiasm of Mr. Gladstone's cooled down. A river in Macedon and a river in Monmouth may have been all the same to Mr. Gladstone, but there was a river in the principality which is peerless in the eyes of the pure Welsh patriot. It is a veritable Pactolus, a stream of gold, with the added virtue of belonging to other people. This stream, of ecclesiastical endowment, the Welshman at last expected to divert to his own uses. He had slaved for Mr. Gladstone. He had lived for Mr. Gladstone. He had—well, we need not call in alliteration's artful aid to specialise the peculiar method of reverencing the great Gladstone cult to which the Welsh character is constitutionally disposed.

And after all this Mr. Gladstone forgot, and played the part of chief butler to all those thirsty Josephs still languishing in the cells of the Estab-

lishment. Dogberry himself would not have endured it. "Taffy was a Welshman, Taffy was a thief," is a tribute to the Welsh character which it was cruel of Mr. Gladstone to ignore. It is always a hardship for an artist to find his opportunities interfered with. But when that artist is on the point of executing his *coup*, with the "jemmy" in position and the dark lantern already up his sleeve, then to stand between him and his "swag" is downright inhumanity. And this is what Mr. Gladstone did when he put Home Rule before Welsh Disestablishment.

But the Welshman has gone one better than Mr. Gladstone. He had put his penny in the slot, or rather his balance in the box, and the promise had indeed come out. But as is the peculiarity of the Gladstone machine, the performance seemed only to be halting after it, and therefore Taffy was equal to the occasion. He had observed that the small boys in the streets show a futile ingenuity in devising substitutes for pence whereby to excite the generosity of these interesting toys. It occurred to Taffy to substitute kicks for halfpence. The inspiration was a happy one. Mr. Gladstone has risen to it, or we might say from it, like another giant refreshed by contact with his native element. First we heard rumours of discontent amongst the Welsh M.P.'s, then a tale of mutiny, and to-day comes the news of the introduction, simultaneously with the Home Rule Bill, of a Suspensory Bill for Wales.

Neither principle nor details of this Bill need here be criticised. The whole transaction is so gross that it is scarcely credible that the House of Commons will tolerate it. It is too shameless for words. It simply represents Mr. Gladstone's answer to a "Stand and Deliver" from a number of political marauders. It is a very Panama of politics. Nobody pretends to believe that Home Rule will be a matter of one Session, perhaps even of one Parliament. It is perfectly certain that until Home Rule is disposed of, no legislation of any other kind will be accomplished. Mr. Gladstone's proposal then is to put a stop to the activity of the Church in Wales for months, perhaps for years. During this interregnum no appointments will be made, no benefices filled up, no work of any kind done which may by any stretch of imagination be considered likely to hinder Disestablishment in the future. Meantime what is to become of the cathedrals, the churches, the schools, the institutions, the parsonage-houses, thus left uncared for, as well as the congregations which employed them? To this no answer is given. Mr. Gladstone simply proposes to *scotch* the Church in Wales, to sting it as spiders sting caterpillars, depriving it of activity, but leaving it just enough life to serve his purpose.

We can understand that this plan would be dear indeed to the heart of the "Taffy" of the distich; and we are tempted to inquire, since Mr. Gladstone's ancestry, like that of many mythical heroes, is known to embrace many countries not to say continents, whether some of the great man's progenitors may have been not Welshmen, but Welshers.

HYPOCRISIS.

Οὐκ ἔσῃ ὥσπερ οἱ ὑποκριταί.—MATT. vi. 5.

ONE of the chief features of character which the prophets assigned to their hoped-for Messiah, and which our Lord's actual life most strikingly displayed, was the extreme meekness and gentleness of His language and manner. He was patient with the greatest of sinners, and to all those who had gone astray through human weakness He showed an indulgence in which authorities, who were far indeed from rising to His perfection, have often doubted whether it was wise or safe to follow Him. "Neither do I condemn thee: go and sin no more." How few mere human beings, dressed in a little brief authority, would venture to apply so light a censure to so grave a case as that of the person to whom those words were first spoken!

But there was one striking exception to this rule of gentleness. Against that sin which He called by a new name, *hypocrisis*, our Lord was unsparingly severe. He declared war against it, and against those who practised it, in His Sermon on the Mount, when yet unopposed and unpersecuted, the religion, that was destined to regenerate the world, was shining forth for the first time in all the hopefulness of its early popularity, as in the freshness and fragrance of a bright morning dawn. And in His later days, when it had become plain that this evil, which He had marked out as His deadliest enemy, would win the first victory, and bring about His death, He spoke against it that chapter of terrible invective, the 23rd of St. Matthew, the whole burden of which is, Woe to the *hypocritæ*.

Our first point must be to understand clearly the meaning of the word. It is one that our Saviour Himself added to our current speech, for no instance can be produced from earlier times of the use of it in the sense in which He used it.* It is true that we cannot tell precisely what word He may have used in His own native Syriac tongue. But we may venture to think that the word by which the Evangelists translated it for the benefit of their Greek-speaking congregations represents exactly His own original word. And this Greek word is very clear and definite, and, before our Lord used it, it had but one meaning. It meant an actor of dramas, and nothing more. "Woe unto you, ye actors," is the literal translation of that severe word of denunciation which was so often on His lips; and the exactest expression of the words of the text is, "Ye shall not be as the actors are."

Thus He sets before us, as an example to be avoided

* ὑποκριτής, in classical Greek, meant simply an *actor* in the theatrical sense. Classical writers sometimes spoke of an *actor* of *temperance*, *virtue*, *philosophy*, etc., which brings the word near to our Saviour's usage of it; but they never used the word *hypocrite* by itself to mean a dissembler of virtue or religion. In the LXX. the word ὑποκριτὴς is twice employed to translate the Hebrew חָנֵף, which those translators render elsewhere, ἀσεβής, παράνομος, ἄνομος, showing that their idea of the meaning of their original was vague Nor does חָנֵף mean specially a dissembler, as ὑποκριτὴς does, but generally a *godless* man, which last word has been selected by the Revisers for use in their translation.

in all matters of morals or religion, a kind of popular artist, whose performances have amused, and delighted, and sometimes, perhaps, instructed us all. He tells us that we must not apply the theatrical art, nor any of its procedures or devices, to our personal, moral, or religious life, or to our mode of teaching, or to our conduct of divine worship. Now the actor is one who puts on for a time and for a purpose a character which is not really his own. Externally he makes himself up for the part which he has to play with dresses, paints, wigs, etc., to appear the person that he is not. In ancient times he had also a mask—a staid, dignified, solemn-looking mask for tragedy, and a grotesque one, with wide, grinning mouth, for comedy. He then learns and rehearses words, attitudes, and gestures, all contrived to make him the life-like representation of a character which is not his own.

But if a person is to be a consummate artist in this line, he must not be content with this external preparation, but he must be internally as well as externally an actor, by evoking artificially in his own mind the illusion which he seeks to produce in his spectators. Those persons who have a real genius for the stage are able to act their parts with such life-like perfection because they have the power of throwing themselves for the moment into the character which they are representing, so as to feel like him, and almost to be what he is. They can work up in themselves all his passions, anger, hatred, pity, love; and then the outward symptoms, in voice, facial expression, gesture, attitude, follow of themselves. Then the whole performance looks like life. Such as these are the stars of the profession. But there are others who are only capable of the external preparation, and these remain always inferior artists, or we might say—adopting our Lord's own sense of the word—imperfect hypocrites.

The same distinction may be noted in that acting of morals and religion, which our Saviour stigmatised under this name of hypocrisy. In the coarser kind, a man is quite conscious of his own untruthfulness; he is a wilful liar, speaking and acting lies; and his pretences of higher motives are, like the actor's dresses, all put on outside. But, in justice to poor human nature, we must say that such persons are very uncommon, if they exist at all. The Tartuffes, Pecksniffs, Stiggins, and such like, are only caricatures. We meet with them in second class works of fiction, but the master of fiction, Shakespeare, who could read human nature like a book, and could detect the good in evil men, and the evil in the good, does not introduce us to one conscious religious hypocrite. The experience of those who have lived long lives in the religious world in daily intercourse with those whose profession is religion—the ground on which conscious hypocrisy would grow, if it were to grow at all—is that they cannot remember the man, whom they dare accuse of being a wilful hypocrite. Even among those Scribes and Pharisees, whom our Lord so bitterly denounced, there was a Gamaliel and a Paul—the former gently, the latter fiercely sincere; and we may be very sure that many other Rabbis and scholars, in the great Hebrew school at Jerusalem, were as truthful as those two.

Our Lord, in His teaching on this subject, first described negatively the faults, which His disciples must avoid, noting the points of theatrical religion, which he observed in the professors of religion, who were actually before his eyes. He saw around Him Scribes and Pharisees, whose religious practices were acting, and He told His disciples that they must not be like them. He applied this negative teaching to the three external practices of the religion of His time—Almsgiving, Prayer, Fasting; and He told His disciples that, in each of these, they must not be as the actors are.

He dealt first with Almsgiving, and condemned a practice which He called acting, though it might be more exactly termed advertising. The Pharisees courted publicity, they sounded a trumpet before them in the streets, and even in the synagogues. But Christ's disciple, He taught, must not thus advertise himself, nor the work that he is doing, nor the sect—Pharisee or other—for which he desires to procure influence. He must keep his act private between himself and God, and only strive to make that act perfectly pure, not only in its outward circumstances, but in those inward motives which the Searcher of hearts only can discern. If he disobeys this rule, and seeks publicity, he is only what the actors are.

Now the trumpet of the nineteenth century is, as has been said already, the advertisement, in all its varied forms; the puff in the newspapers, the placard in the railway station, the unctuous letter sent in hundreds and thousands through the post, and other modes too numerous to mention. It is this that blazes abroad the names of individual givers, and of the churches or sects, which seek to gain influence through conspicuous religious or philanthropic works. And it receives at once its whole reward (*ἀπέχει τὸν μισθὸν αὐτοῦ*). The success of charitable enterprises, like that of commercial speculations, is in exact proportion to the skill and perseverance with which they advertise themselves. The vogue of General Booth (easily the prince of advertisers), of Dr. Barnardo, of a mildly ascetic community like that which has its home under the shadow of St. Peter of Kilburn, of all the missionary societies, and in fact of every philanthropic enterprise, is created and maintained by the advertisement and the puff.

Do we then advise all these successful philanthropists to forego what experience has taught to be the one condition of success, and to be only solicitous to purify their own motives from all personal or sectarian self-seeking, in the sight of Him who loves neither egotists nor partisans? Must they thus doom their flourishing institutions to certain decay and extinction? This would be an awful sacrifice, which perhaps we hardly dare press them to accept. Only let them not be boastful of their method, for it is not that of Jesus of Nazareth. He admitted that the sounder of the trumpet always reaped the immediate reward; but He promised a higher reward, and a more permanent success to the secret worker, who had faith enough to purify his own motives under the eye of the Searcher of hearts.

But, in an advertising age, who is there that has faith to make in secret golden deeds, pure from all mixture of self interest, self-display, or that party-spirit, which to members of Salvation Armies, Church Unions, Church Associations, Church Extension Societies, and other such like institutions, passes for a virtue; and so to place them in the Father's hands, to be made use of when He will and as He will, for His purposes not for the doer's own. content that they should be made known, if publicity seems to Him useful, but preferring much that they should be never known or soon forgotten, except by Him who knows all and forgets none?

Our Lord's next lesson dealt with the externals of

Prayer. His disciples were commanded not to be actors of it, as the Pharisees were, in the corners of the streets, or even in the synagogues—these sanctuaries where God's people met, and where He might be expected to meet them—nor anywhere in the sight of men: the person, who had requests to offer to his heavenly Father, must go home, and shut himself into the store-closet or pantry (ταμιεῖον), which was the only enclosure, apart from the general living room, that a poor man's house in Galilee contained, and there offer up his prayer. It seems hard that so beautiful a thing as prayer should be thus driven out of sight, and strange that our Lord should be insensible to the æsthetic capabilities of its external act, and to the edifying effect of its public exhibition. What more beautiful or more edifying than an Oriental on his praying carpet by a desert track, or on a ship's deck, bowing before Allah, heedless of the passers-by; or a peasant woman on her knees before a wayside Madonna or crucifix; or a penitent crouching in the posture of contrition in the dim religious light of a Gothic aisle; or even the Pharisee himself, standing in his long flowing robe, with the Hebrew letters embroidered on the hem, and the frontlet between his eyes! Nor did the Lord offer any picture to replace this artistic loss, except that of a dim figure standing in a dark pantry, with vulgar domestic stores on the shelves around it. Even the genius of Mr. Holman Hunt would be baffled in an attempt to give artistic treatment to so unpicturesque a subject. Yet these were the orders—Enter into thy store-room and shut the door. Did not Jesus of Nazareth carry His dislike of acted religion to an extreme when He issued such a command? The divines of the present period have recognised it as a proof of His infinite condescension, that He deigned to confine His knowledge within the narrow horizon of a Galilean peasant; must He not have imposed still narrower limits on His capacity to appreciate the elevating influence of religious art? What effect could be produced by such puritanical teaching except to drive all æsthetic beauty out of worship, and all poetry out of religious life? For indeed it is not religion itself, but only the acting of it, that can become the subject of artistic treatment. If acting is forbidden, all the æsthetic beauty and attractiveness of prayer is lost.

Our Lord's third piece of external regulation related to Fasting. The strict religious professors of His time had a calendar of days of ceremonial abstinence. It is true that only one of these days dates from the law of Moses. But, even in the time of the earlier prophets, days of such solemn observance had been appointed for special national and private emergencies. And, since the captivity in Babylon, the custom had become established of keeping four annual fasts (Zech. viii. 19), and two weekly ones (Luke xviii. 12) on the Monday and Thursday (Didache, 8). This practice had become an ecclesiastical tradition, which not only the Pharisees but the disciples of John the Baptist punctually observed. On such occasions the strict observers adopted a fasting costume, put on a severe and solemn countenance, or hid (ἀφανίζουσι) their faces in their robe. But our Lord treated this custom with very scant respect. He called it a mere *acting* of abstinence, and He taught that the fasts of His disciples, like their alms and their prayers, must not be made public observances, but private exercises, in which each person must be seeking only that reward from the heavenly Father, which can be nothing else than the spiritual improvement of heart and life which results from overcoming appetite.

Let us ask, then, Are the fasting observances of our day in accordance with this expression of our Saviour's mind—these periodical changes of diet, which are entirely formal, containing no genuine effort of self-discipline, and leading to no permanent abridgment of self-indulgent luxury?—these Lenten toilets, designed by fashionable milliners as a gratification of self-conceit and self-display?—these ceremonial acts of worship, for which the rush of worldly pleasure is adjourned for a few days, to be returned to with keener zest when the appointed days are past? Is not all this *hypocrisis*—the acting of a part? Does the elegant world ever address such questions as these to itself? and do the fashionable priests, who depend for their position and influence upon the favour of the wealthy and luxurious, diligently press such questions upon those exquisite flocks of the children of this world, whose consciences are in their keeping, and rebuke the *hypocrisis* which is so flagrant in the congregations to which they minister? Do they teach that the only fasting which has the sanction of Jesus of Nazareth is not periodical, ceremonial, or public, but secret, real, and permanently sustained self-discipline?

Every clerical body needs to remember a lesson of our Lord, which nevertheless every clergy recorded in history has with one consent forgotten or ignored—that they themselves are the class of men most exposed to the danger of falling into *hypocrisis*. Even a Divine mission, and an admitted succession of clerical office, is no protection against this danger. Our Lord's whole history demonstrates this fact. His religion came into being amidst the deadliest opposition of a clergy whose claim to authority He Himself admitted to be legitimate and Divine. The Scribes and Pharisees, He said Himself, sate in Moses' seat administering all that yet remained of the prophetic office. Nor did He ever Himself deny, while His disciples expressly admitted, the succession of the priests from that Aaron who had been called of God (John xi. 49, 51; Heb. v. 4). Yet both priests and scribes, with one mouth, rejected and condemned Him. The fundamental cause of that rejection was, that He was essentially truthful, while they were only actors, and therefore there could be no sympathy between Him and them. Our clergy, equally with that which was contemporary with our Lord, needs, in the performance of their sacred duties, to be ever on the watch against the danger of subsiding into *hypocrisis*, against which besetting sin of priests and theologians no external call from God can sufficiently protect them.

Now there are two departments of clerical duty which are specially exposed to this danger, the prophetic and the priestly, preaching and the conduct of Divine worship. In each of these the clergy must listen to our Lord's warning, "Thou shalt not be as the actors are."

Preaching is often treated as a species of acting. In those early days when Christ's religion passed over from the simple peasants of Galilee to the cultivated classes of Greek and Latin tongue, it met with schools and universities, in which young Pagans were trained for active life, in which careers were open to the makers of phrases and masters of speech. In these schools professors of elocution and rhetoric taught the modulation of the voice, the management of action, attitude, and gesture, the invention and production of

winning phrase and plausible argument. They trained the youth as an actor to play his part upon the public stage. Even in those days there were higher minds among the heathen, like Marcus Aurelius, who turned in disgust from such untruthful training. It would have been well for Christianity if the Fathers of the Church had done the same. But most of them were rhetoricians; and, following their example in later days, places of clerical education have had their professors of artificial speech, who trained those who were being prepared to become interpreters of the Word of God to be as the actors are, or at least to speak as the actors speak.

There is danger now of the same evil intruding among us again; there is even a demand in many quarters for a restoration of such training. May God defend us from it! for the only result of it can be to train all truthfulness out of those who ought to be its witnesses and examples. The one rule for the public teacher of religion must ever be to speak out truth, as in the presence of God, to the conscience of man. To learn and rehearse tones, attitudes, and gestures—to call up artificially for exhibition emotions which are not his own—to use plausible arguments whose fallacy he knows—to make statements which he knows to be untrue—to attempt in any way to appear that which he is not—all these are portions of the actor's art, which that truthful Being, whose disciples we profess to be, has taught us to reject with disgust and scorn.

But does the same rule prevail with regard to worship — that external ceremonial, in which the minister of religion addresses God, and through which he attempts to approach Him? Is all acting to be excluded also here?

The prevalent customs of our age seem to say decidedly that, in this case, the words of our Lord have no application, and that it is right for the ministers of religion to be what the actors are. Worship has now adopted all the appliances of the theatrical art. It has its stage elevated to exhibit the performers, its artificial light produced by tapers and many coloured glass, its building which has the effect of theatrical scenery. In such a scene the actors are dressed in character, marshalled in processions, grouped in *tableaux*. They recite words, of which every tone has been studied, and execute a programme of prearranged and rehearsed attitudes and gestures. The architects, the makers of ornaments, images, and pictures have all combined their efforts to provide the properties and scenery, which heighten the effect of the whole performance.

And He, whose chosen places of worship were the hill, and the lake-side, and the garden, and the field path, where the sheep pasture and the corn grows, and the birds receive their food from their heavenly Father, and the open sky, whence that Father sends His rain and His sunshine to the just and the unjust, who, when He visited the temple, took not the smallest notice of the ceremonial there exhibited, but led His disciples aside into an upper room, where He gathered them round Him for the domestic celebration of the Passover, and there ate His last meal with them, all reclining (ἀνακείμενοι) at one common board, the disciple's head close to the Master's breast, with no distinction made between them except that the Master was the most servant-like—even He is supposed to take delight in the theatrical scene, and actually to descend from heaven to place Himself in the midst of it as the chief actor, and to identify Himself with the material substance, which is the centre of the performance, and the object of the fond idolatry.

If these views are true, and this ceremonial acceptable, then the Being, who accepts it, is quite another Jesus from Him who denounced the actors, and whom those actors rejected and condemned to die.

It is not difficult to note the acting which prevails as flagrantly in the present religious world as in that which our Lord reproved; for we can always see but too clearly the motes in our brethren's eyes. But it is very difficult to describe the character and conduct which ought to supersede the prevalent *hypocrisis*. The writer or speaker, who would compose such a description, must first understand and appreciate thoroughly the character and conduct of Jesus of Nazareth Himself. And, as he attempts the task, his conscience tells him that he has not in himself that new nature from above, which would enable him to see and understand that kingdom, or reigning, or sovereignty of God in the heart and conduct of a man of which Jesus Himself was the only perfect example. His heart says to him, Thou art not yet born from above, how then canst thou see the kingdom of God. Yet he may perhaps venture to quote some words of the Master's own.

There must be a single eye (ὀφαλμὸς ἁπλοῦς)—the inward heart's eye — not wandering among many spectators, as the actor's is, but fixed on One—One spectator of the life, One auditor of the words, One inspector and appraiser of all tasks of work and duty, and, if the baser thought of recompense is ever permitted to intrude, One rewarder at the last.

There must be a single eye directed towards one aim or object, which may be represented to the mind in various forms of expression, but which is to God's true children always one and the same. The Greek moral philosophers called that object virtue, the Jews righteousness; our Lord retained the Jewish word, but also added expressions of His own—doing the will of the heavenly Father, the kingdom or prevalence of God and His goodness in man's heart. One, who was not a Christian, yet perhaps the very best and truest of mankind, named man's object best of all, when he said that it was simply to be good (ἀγαθὸν εἶναι). This is the one worthy object which is actually within the reach of man. The craving for forgiveness is mere selfishness; zeal for an earthly Church is egotism in disguise; the vision of heaven may be destined to fade away; but goodness is a present achievement, and carries with it a present reward; and, if there be a better life to come, it is for goodness that the God of love and justice reserves the future crown. This is the one thing needful, this the hidden treasure, this the pearl of price.

But the eye cannot remain thus single, conscious of one Master, aiming at one object, seeking one reward, if it be drawn asunder by dividing cares (μέριμναι). Therefore it must have grace and power to cast itself upon the one great Providence, who cares for all—for the birds of the air, and the flowers of the field, as truly as for man himself. Those other creatures of God have each their little span of earthly life, and after that, as we suppose, no more. Man, too, has his short period, not much longer than theirs, and after that he knows not what he shall be, save only that he himself and his future are in his Father's hand. And he, for his part, is content to leave all there, hoping against doubts and fears for continued existence, and for reunion with the early dead, and even for life eternal.

A single mind's eye with one Father, one aim, one

reward, one contented harmonious life, and one hope to cheer the end, is what a disciple of Christ should have.

There was a disciple of His, who had never seen his Master except in vision, who nevertheless had received an idea of Him, which he expressed in one single word—sincerity (*εἰλικρίνεια*). Paul's original word is a lovely one (*εἰλικρίνεια θεοῦ*), the sincerity of God, divine sincerity, of which the divine Man was the earthly example. The word means literally transparency, or, more exactly still, the state of being searched through by the sunbeams. It contains in itself a complete poem. Imagine a lake, or river, or fountain, whose clear water is shone through by the sun. As we look into its quiet depths, we see all that is there—the pebbles at the bottom, each in its own several form and colour, the fishes basking motionless or darting to and fro, the bubbles sparkling upwards to the surface. It is not shallowness but purity that makes so clearly visible all that is or moves therein.

Such was the character of Jesus of Nazareth, deep, yet pellucid through its perfect sincerity—that quality which all the New Testament writers, but John especially, call His truth (*ἀλήθεια*). His words, His actions, His thoughts, His character were all perfectly truthful. Were a speck of conscious untruthfulness to be detected in Him, He must cease to be regarded as the world's Messiah. Truth is His motto or device, the substance of His religion, the foundation of His power. His kingdom is one of truth, a citizen of which is every truthful mind ; and its final triumph can never come until all are truthful like Him.

This subject ought to leave us all determined to be true at whatever sacrifice. The heart must first be forced to render up all its insincerities, and then it will shrink in disgust from all that is untruthful in religious practice. It will utter no words of false rhetoric, simulate no unreal emotions, rehearse and exhibit no artificial attitudes of prayer. Its single eye, diverted from those outside by whom it might be praised, or over whom it might acquire influence, will be fixed on Him alone, who is served only by truthful words and actions. Such alone promote that kingdom of His, which is righteousness, and peace, and joy. Other words and actions may produce more effect in the world, and win the immediate reward, but do not serve His purposes, for they are not truth, but *hypocrisis*.

And if, at any time, worship sinks into acting, and churches become theatres for the exhibition of ceremonial, and ministers or priests are content to be even as the actors are, still there will remain open all those doors through which Jesus was wont to approach His Father—still God's temple not made with hands, in which every object is His immediate work—still, perhaps, a chamber here and there, where men who are trying to be true and good may meet to encourage each other in their high endeavour, until the time comes when priests and scribes become weary of *hypocrisis*, and the people demand to be taught again, as Jesus of Nazareth once taught them, in singleness and truth.

THE Bishop of the Church of England in Japan (Dr. Edward Bickersteth) has arrived at the Cambridge Mission, Delhi, where he is spending a few days with his former colleagues. He is expected in England early in March, when he will endeavour to secure further workers for his Missions in Japan.

Reviews and Notices.

"THE EXPOSITOR." Feb., 1893. London : Hodder and Stoughton.

DEAN CHADWICK writes very well on Christ at the Pool of Bethesda, though we wish there was more about the miracle and less about Keim and the German Rationalists. The "Survey of Literature," by Dr. Marcus Dods, is a very good guide to the student.

Professor Stanton's paper may be a very good one, but we are so heartily sick of German theories on the Synoptic Gospels that we only glanced at it. Professor Findlay writes on the First Epistle of St. John, and Dr. Taylor on Wellhausen's "Minor Prophets." This is the poorest number of the *Expositor* we ever remember.

"THE EXPOSITORY TIMES." Feb., 1893. Edinburgh : T. and T. Clark.

WE are delighted to hear from Professor Marshall that his papers in the *Expositor* have been "warmly welcomed by many scholars of the first rank as a probably hypothesis awaiting further development." We look forward with great pleasure to his promised paper in the March number.

Bishop Ellicott continues his series on the "Teaching of our Lord as to the authority of the Old Testament," a series which Professor Cheyne is wise in his generation in treating with his usual lofty condescension rather than answering.

The writer of the Notes—always very interesting—praises Mr. Moore Ede's Cambridge sermon, which seems to have been a sort of forecast of coming troubles from an uprising of the oppressed operatives. Mr. Moore Ede should read the paper by Mr. Gould in the January *Contemporary Review*, or the article in the *Spectator* of January 28th. The operatives are very comfortably off, and so much the better when they don't drink—far better off than the unfortunate farmer.

"THE SERMON BIBLE." Vol. X. 2 Corinthians—Philippians. London : Hodder and Stoughton.

HAVING spoken already in terms of high praise about the preceding nine volumes of this useful series, we really hardly know what more we can say of the tenth volume than that it seems, so far as we have examined it, quite equal to its predecessors. In the Introduction the editor advises about the best commentaries, etc. We think he should have given especial recommendation to Dr. Dale's "Lectures on Ephesians," much the best we know of.

ON Monday the Benchers of the Middle Temple chose a successor to Canon Ainger as Reader of the Temple. From a large number of candidates the following four had been selected :—The Rev. S. A. Alexander, tutor of Keble College, Oxford ; the Rev. H. C. Beeching, rector of Yattendon, Berks ; the Rev. E. W. Chapman, honorary Canon of Carlisle, curate of St. Luke's, Chelsea ; and the Rev. D. C. Tovey, rector of Worplesden, Surrey. Each of them preached in a London church, so that the Benchers might hear him. The choice fell upon the Rev. S. A. Alexander, who obtained a large majority of votes.

CORRESPONDENCE.

To the Editor of the CHURCH OF ENGLAND PULPIT AND ECCLESIASTICAL REVIEW.

THE TEMPTATION IN EDEN.

SIR,—Before closing the discussion on the Temptation, I should wish to bring forward one point, which makes strongly for the "pictorial representation" view, and which has not as yet been sufficiently developed. I refer to the antiquity of man, a most important factor in this, as in other old-world stories. As more than one recent writer on Genesis is taking this antiquity into account, it seems *à propos* that I should briefly lay its salient points before your readers.

Now it does not seem so long ago that the Church awoke to the fact that men of science had emancipated themselves from Usher's Chronology—unfortunately still printed in our Bibles. 4004 B.C. for the date of the Creation, said the Archbishop, with all the gravity of well-meaning ignorance, and our latest copies of the Bible reproduce 4004 B.C. in the margin of the first chapter of Genesis, with less pardonable assurance than that good divine, who, like Josephus (*Ant.* X. viii. 5), liked to fix exact dates. For the world of science has left that bauble of time very far behind indeed. It did not even pause for a moment at the later suggestion of a good and learned bishop of an English see, who proposed that the chronology of the LXX. should be accepted in lieu of the Hebrew, as it allowed about six hundred more years between the Creation and the Deluge. "What is that betwixt me and thee?" said science, as it went off untrammelled—

> "To drill and bore
> The solid earth, and from the strata there
> Extract a register, by which we learn
> That He who made it, and revealed its date
> To Moses, was mistaken in its age."

So wrote the gentle Cowper, mildest of men, but ignorant of the simple fact that God has revealed no chronology in the Bible. Modern divines see it now, who argue eagerly that the six plain, ordinary days of Genesis, as understood hitherto by Josephus, the Talmud, and the Church, imply æons of untold duration. Be it so. It certainly helps to adjust "the series of representative pictures" of the Creation in Genesis with the requirements of science, whose chronology is not measured by paltry years, but by geological strata and astronomical ages. Usher's chronology of the Bible is practically abandoned, and should be expunged, as misleading to the young and the unlearned.

Assuming that the antiquity of the earth is granted by your readers as something far greater than till recently supposed, it naturally follows that they are prepared to admit that the antiquity of man exceeds previous belief. For if God has left the age of the world vague and undetermined in the Bible, what evidence is there to show that He has fixed the latter? None at all. The series of Biblical pictures follow one another in the first chapter of Genesis, like dissolving views on a screen, without any reference to definite time, and man, as the last of God's creation, may, for aught we know, have appeared on this planet hundreds of thousands of years ago. Where can we go for information but to the earth itself, as man's abode, if haply we can find his remains in river drift and gravel and caves? This is exactly what palæontologists have done, and the result of their labours to the present day may be summed up in the statement that beyond the commencement of the historical period in Chaldæa and Egypt, say approximately from six to seven thousand years ago, past the bronze age and the polished stone age, past the lake-dwellings and kitchen-middens, past the cave-men, with their bone implements and carvings of reindeer, wild horses, bear, and mammoth, right through the post-glacial to the long inter-glacial and pre-glacial periods, the undoubted remains of man and his handicraft have been found abundantly in many parts of the globe. The question with the scientific is not of man's existence in the quarternary period, for that is regarded as established, but in the more remote tertiary. For that the evidence is accumulating, and it is highly probable that before long competent palæontologists will agree on this far more distant age of mankind. But for my argument it is enough if we take the more recent period, the quarternary, which synchronises with the great ice age. Now, from the theory of Croll, as amended by Sir Robert Ball, it is proved, with fair mathematical certainty, that this period must have lasted for about 200,000 years. And as man existed in the pre-glacial period, and was already widely spread, and in considerable numbers in the early glacial, Mr. S. Laing claims "that 250,000 years may be taken as an approximation to the minimum duration of the existence of the human race on earth." I might say something on the evidence showing that, in those far off times, there were at least three distinct races in Europe of palæolithic men, and probably a fourth in America, thus putting further back the origin of our human race. Enough has been said, however, to show the extreme improbability of the story of the Temptation, either belonging to that remote age, or having been handed down intact and verbatim through that wide stretch of time. The probability is infinitely greater that the author of Genesis took the traditions of his Chaldæan race, purged them of polytheism and its incongruities, and reset them, as jewels of great price, in the casket of monotheism, fit offering in the Temple of the one great God. That is the view which I uphold, a view which takes cognizance of the conclusions of modern science, as well as of the reverence due to the Bible. In a word, "it renders unto Cæsar the things which be Cæsar's and unto God the things which be God's."

But, sir, however some theologians may refuse to move on with the times, there are others who think that the nineteenth century requires a resetting of traditional views, and the abandonment of what is antiquated. The Rev. W. O. Newnham, in his "Alresford Essays for the Times," is such a one. He is conscious of the claims of science for the great antiquity of man, and he interprets the creation of man in the sixth day of Genesis as relating to a pre-Adamite race, Adam himself being formed in the seventh day, or epoch rather, as he understands it. It does not tally with the lesson of rest on the seventh day, a lesson which naturally is for man's behoof only, but it shows that he is not insensible to the claims of palæontology.

Mr. Capron, another recent writer on Genesis, goes beyond Mr. Newnham. He accepts Evolution as scientifically established; he allows that God "caused animal life to develop, from lowly and humble forms, up to something higher than the ape—higher than neolithic man." He claims that, in the process of evolution, a time came when man, sufficiently physically and mentally developed, "became fitted

to receive and possess the attribute of spirituality.' When this point was reached, God, by a process described as Creation, conferred the new gift of spirituality upon a single member of the race, Adam, who by this gift was "created in the image of God." By this ingenious view Mr. Capron claims, that if this distinctive feature was first impressed upon man, about six thousand years ago, there is nothing in the Biblical account which contradict science; the scientific discoveries of Neolithic and Palæolithic man not applying to the spiritual Adam, to which Genesis refers, but only to lower beings in the human scale.

Mr. Capron's view deserves consideration. It certainly allows for the existence of intellectual man "not years, nor centuries, but long ages before spiritual man." This is the point for which I contend, the recognition of the great antiquity of man. How it came to pass that Mr. Capron's "spiritual man," with the inevitable big "S," fell at the first temptation, no better than if he had been the "brutal" man of Neanderthal, or the "pithecoid" man of Spy, I must leave him to explain. It is certainly not manifest on the face of it At any rate, both these authors have the merit of taking account of the conclusions of modern science, and I submlt that as we have already yielded in the matter "days," in the first chapter of Genesis, we are debarred from disregarding the antiquity of man in the third. It was after the peace of Amiens, I believe, that the House of Commons was discussing the terms of some commercial treaty with France relative to the West Coast of Africa and its exports, when Sheridan, who was opposed to the peace, exclaimed, "Since you have let the French draw your teeth, what is the use of fighting about the gums?" *Verb. sap*

F. T. P.

DIVINE ECLECTICISM.

SIR,—I hope you will permit me to call attention to the anti-moral falsehood of Mr. Hogg's teaching in his article, which you published in the PULPIT of January 21st, on "Divine Eclecticism." He means Divine *Election*. Eclecticism is something totally different, namely, the choosing and combining of what is best in all races and all systems. There is a natural prejudice against the word election in a theological sense, in consequence of the way it has been misused in the Calvinistic heresy; but the word is used by St. Paul, and the fact is an obvious part of the Divine government, both in nature and grace.

Mr. Hogg says of Jacob and David: "It is abundantly evident that both these men, the patriarchal sharper and the royal libertine, despite their undoubted failings, were possessed of spiritual insight, were imbued with inner qualities which in God's sight more than counterbalanced the absence of some particular virtues."

If this is Christianity, I much prefer decent worldliness. But it is not Christianity. Nothing can be more unlike the teaching of Christ than this teaching, that God will accept "spiritual insight" as a substitute for rectitude of action and purity of life. God has infinite compassion for sins of ignorance, as witnessed in the prayer of Christ, "Father, forgive them, for they know not what they do." But dishonesty and impurity in those who have spiritual insight must be "presumptuous sins."

How, then, is the action of God in the cases o Jacob and David to be justified? I do not know. But this I do know, that none but the pure in heart and life shall see God; and those who are not pure must become so by repentance and faith.

Jan. 23rd, 1893. M.

LAST week the Ven. A. B. Crosse, late Archdeacon of Furness, was installed Canon-residentiary of Norwich Cathedral.

AT a meeting of the Peterborough Cathedral Restoration Executive Committee on Thursday, the Bishop of Leicester in the chair, an offer of a canopied reredos, designed by Mr. Pearson, was received through the Dean-designate from the eight surviving children of the late Dr. Saunders, Dean of Peterborough from 1873 to 1878, as a memorial to their father and mother. The offer was gratefully accepted.

THE cathedral for this month in the *Builder* is Ripon, which is not so profusely illustrated as most of its predecessors. The only portion of Wilfrid's seventh-century work remaining (perversely called Saxon) is the crypt under the central tower, and it is said that the church itself had, after the Italian manner, the altar at the west end. The present structure is mainly Perpendicular, with Early English west front, Norman transepts and chapter-house, and Decorated east end.

FUNERAL REFORM.—Dr. Norman Kerr, speaking at the monthly meeting of the Funeral Reform Association, held last week at the Church House, Westminster, said that prevalent burial customs were directly contrary to the Christian faith, dispiriting, injurious to the health of the bereaved, cruelly costly, and noxious to residents in the vicinity of the buried dead. Christian ministers taught that death was no break in the continuity of life, but a transference into a higher sphere of being; yet, after a death, every room was darkened and the clothing worn was of the deepest black. Nothing could be more depressing, dispiriting, and harmful. With the light of heaven shut out, the digestion was impaired, and the whole system lowered. Thus physical was added to mental distress. The body reacting upon the mind the depression deepened, and the susceptibility to the malign influence of infectious germs increased. And this depressing process lasted hour after hour, day by day, until the body was buried. No wonder, with all this ghastly factitious environment of gloom intensifying natural grief, and disturbing vital functions, that reason sometimes tottered on her throne. Up then with the blinds, and let in the glad sunshine, to cheer the weary heart, chase away the horrors of the dismal darkness, and send the blood more quickly through the veins! And in inclement weather let all the service be said in the church, and the mourners be protected at the grave-side by a portable tent. To die was as natural as to be born. All who had influence should set an example of common sense, and sternly oppose all meretricious, costly and insanitary funeral observances.

PREFERMENTS AND APPOINTMENTS.

Alexander, Rev. Sidney Arthur, Tutor of Keble College, Oxford; Reader of the Temple.

Atherton. Rev. E. C., M.A., Curate of Stoke Damerel; Vicar of Holy Trinity, Barnstaple.

Butler, Rev. Herbert E., Rector of Watermillock, Ulleswater, Penrith; Vicar of Wolstanton, Staffordshire.

Caffin, Rev. Philip Charles, M.A., Curate; Rector of Weston Bamfylde, Somersetshire.
Dunne, Rev. James William, Curate of St. Luke's, Millwall; Vicar of Laisterdyke, Bradford.
Eliot, Rev. Charles John; Vicar of Wellesbourne, Warwick.
Ferguson, Rev. Edwin Augustus, M.A.; Rector of Bulwick, Wansford.
Gerratt, Rev. William J., Vicar of St. John-the-Baptist's, Gannow; Surrogate for the Diocese of Manchester.
Hewson, Rev. Henry Newington Clarke; Rector of Cosgrove, Stony Stratford.
Hughes, Rev. Evan, M.A.; Rector of Dingley, Market Harborough.
Hurrell, Rev. W. Philip, late Curate of St. Mark's, Peterborough; Vicar of St. James's, Dallington, Northants.
Ingham, Right Rev. E. G., D.D., Bishop of Sierra Leone; Chaplain to the Forces at Freetown.
Jecks, Rev. Charles B., B.A.; Rector of St. Katherine's, Uitenhage, Diocese of Grahamstown.
Kaufmann, Rev. Moritz, M.A.; Rector of Ingworth, and Vicar (by dispensation) of Calthorpe, Norfolk.
Knapp, Rev. T. Lloyd, M.A., Vicar of St. James's, Oldham; Surrogate for the Diocese of Manchester.
Newton, Rev. Arthur F., Curate of St. John's, Walham Green; Minor Canon of Ely Cathedral.
Phillips, Rev. John R., Vicar of Llanvrechva, Newport; Perpetual Curate of Holy Trinity, Abergavenny.
Pratt, Rev. Henry Madan, M.A.; Rector of Alford and Hornblotton, Somersetshire.
Pym, Rev. W. Ruthven, Vicar of St. Andrew's, Sharrow, Sheffield; Vicar of Rotherham.
Quick, Rev. Henry George, Curate of St. Saviour's, Woolcott-park, Bristol; Vicar of Drayton, Somerset.
Rees, Rev. G. L. M.; Vicar of Allerthorpe-with-Thornton, Yorkshire.
Secretan, Rev. S., of Copthall, Acton; Licensed to Officiate in the Diocese of London.
Smith, Rev. Herbert Powell, B.A.; Rector of Ruskington, Sleaford.
Spencer, Rev. Abraham, M.A., Vicar of Haslingden; Surrogate for the Diocese of Manchester.
Stocks, Rev. John Edward, M.A., Vicar of St. Saviour's, Leicester; Honorary Canon of Peterborough Cathedral.
Syers, Rev. Canon H. S., M.A., Rector of Barnack; Rural Dean of Peterborough Second Deanery.
Trend, Rev. J. B., M.A.; Chaplain of St. James's Home, Fulham.
Wakeford, Rev. William; Head Master of St. Saviour's Choir School, Eastbourne.
Watkins, Rev. J., M.A., Rector of Willingham; Rural Dean of Chesterton.
Wells, Rev. G. F., late Rector of Boxford, Berks; Rector of St. Peter's, March.
White, Rev. George Whit; Vicar of Cranwell, Sleaford.
Wilcockson, Rev. J. H., M.A., Incumbent of Christ Church, Weston Point; Perpetual Curate of Henbury, Cheshire.
Willis, Rev. W. A.; Rector of Llanrothal, Herefordshire.
Wood, Rev. Edward James, B.A.; Perpetual Curate of St. Nicholas's, Whiston, Preston.

CLERICAL OBITUARY.

Anderson, Rev. M., Rector of Kemberton and Vicar of Sutton Maddock, at Seddlescombe Rectory, Battle, on the 3rd inst., aged 93.
Campbell, Rev. John, B.A., Rector of St. Elizabeth, at Stonyhill, St. Andrew, Jamaica, on the 1st ult., aged 83.
Cottingham, Rev. Henry, M.A., Canon of Southwell, and Vicar of Heath and Ault Hucknall, at Heath Vicarage, on the 29th ult., aged 77.
Crowdy, Rev. William Slater, M.A., at the Parsonage, Thursford, on the 31st ult,, aged 78.
Driver, Rev. George Frederick, M.A., Rector of Cuxham-cum-Easington, at Cuxham Rectory, Oxon, on the 29th ult., aged 47.
Gale, Rev. John Henry, for forty-seven years Vicar of the parish, at Milton Vicarage, Pewsey, on the 30th ult., aged 72.
Mason, Venerable Archdeacon, late Vicar of Longcross, on the 21st ult., aged 64.
Turner, Rev. Thomas Richard, at Wimbledon, on the 31st ult., aged 62.

FIRST REMOVE THE CAUSE.

MEN frequently worry and trouble themselves a great deal in trying to cure the symptoms of vital weakness nervous exhaustion, and kindred ailments, instead of endeavouring to first remove the cause. This can be done by Mr. Harness' Electropathic Treatment without the aid of drugs. It is useless to tell sufferers to employ their minds and bodies in useful work and to forget their disorders, so long as the cause of their troubles is not removed. How can it be expected that when they are fatigued by the least exertion they can occupy themselves by studying, walking, or other exercise? Even in conversation they frequently lose the thread of it and repeatedly find their memory failing them. What can they do? Physic will not cure them—perhaps the leading physicians have fallen to afford them any relief, and they have consequently become hopeless. It is to such as these that Mr. Harness' new combined Electropathic Belt and Suspensory is so strongly recommended, as, by its gentle but continuous action, invigorating electric currents are imperceptibly generated and conveyed direct from the spinal cord to the affected parts. It is this scientifically constructed and convenient appliance which silently but surely acts upon the vital organs, and removes the cause of the patient's disease, effecting a wonderful change in his health, character, and conduct, and speedily enabling him to return to his natural tastes and habits, and enjoy once more the full vigour of youth, with all its accompanying pleasures.

We may add that this perfect Electro-medical appliance is exceedingly comfortable to wear, gives wonderful support and vitality to all the internal organs of the body, prevents chills, imparts new life and vigour to the debilitated constitution, stimulates the organic action, promotes the circulation, assists digestion, and promptly renews that vital energy, the loss of which is the first symptom of decay. Its healing properties are multifarious. It stimulates the functions of various organs, increases their secretions, gives tone to muscle and nerves, relaxes morbid contractions, improves nutrition, and effectually renews exhausted nerve force. Acting directly on the system, it sustains and assists its various functions, and thus promotes the health and vigour of the entire frame. Besides these benefits, the mind is maintained in a buoyant, cheerful state, and every faculty is stimulated to the highest condition of intellectual strength.

Gentlemen who read the above announcement have only to visit London and call at the Electropathic and Zander Institute (52, Oxford Street, W.) to be convinced of the marvellous curative powers of Electricity and Mr. Harness' perfect methods of imperceptibly applying the current. The medical officers of the establishment are in daily attendance, and may by consulted free of charge either personally or by letter.

The Church of England Pulpit.

THE WISDOM OF SELF-COMMUNION.

By the Rev. CHARLES RICHARD PANTER, M.A., LL.D.

Sermon Preached at Holy Trinity, Pau, France, on May 8th, 1892.

"I communed with mine own heart, saying, Lo, I am come to great estate, and have gotten more wisdom than all they that have been before me in Jerusalem: yea, my heart had great experience of wisdom and knowledge."—Eccles. i. 16.

KING SOLOMON'S life is the clue to the moral philosophy of his book of Ecclesiastes. Judging from internal evidence, the book was written near the end of his days, and much of it written at the melancholy dictate of an uneasy and imperious conscience. Internal evidence also shows all the marks of identity of authorship between this book and the book of Proverbs. It would be false personation for any other than Solomon to claim, as the writer of the text does, that he had more estate, wisdom, and knowledge than all they that had been before him in Jerusalem. Who other than Solomon dare assert he had greater wealth and greater wisdom than all his predecessors? Certain criticism would deprive him of its authorship; but, to my mind, no critic has yet succeeded in robbing him of the literary copyright in the book. Indulgence in cavilling objections against his evident right to the authorship of Ecclesiastes, seems to me like the presumption of the ape which I once saw chattering over the open pages of Socrates.

Viewed as a piece of literature, the book is a stately oration, adorned with personal narrative, epigrammatic axioms, and poetic emblems; and composed with much study and care, to be delivered by one accustomed to address large audiences from the seat of judgment. The tenour of its philosophy traces the feelings of one whose heart is harrowed by the memory of past misdeeds, whose spirit is smitten to the quick with the keen pangs of self-rebuke and penitent sorrow. Why is this book a true evangel of moral philosophy? Because it is a message from a mind inspired with a true and vivid sense of repentance, and enlightened to divide with sharp distinction the good from the evil. Here a mind tutored in experience of good and evil, of wisdom and folly, laments its choice of evil rather than good, its wealth of opportunity squandered, and good time ill-spent in the revelry and devilry of sense and sin. The writer's capacity for temporal designs and judgments had indeed been early ripened to perfection; and his judgment of spiritual things, although nearly blasted in the bloom by the burning mistral of passion, yet, by the dew of Heaven's mercy, recovered strength to bear the fruit of spiritual knowledge. For God had promised Solomon *all* wisdom, and in due time spiritual, the prime of all understanding, was to be his. He was ordained to show from practical experience the exceeding foolishness of folly; and he, the most sagacious, the most successful human being that ever lived, demonstrates that an evil life brings as a climax, at bitter best, the dearly-purchased wisdom of repentance, or, at a more bitter worst, the vain anguish of remorse—that, while pleasure burns hottest, the arrow-head is being forged which shall strike and stab the soul that sinneth—

"Remorse, remorse,
'Tis pleasure's corse."

"I communed with mine own heart."—Solomon, by self-communion, by questioning his own consciousness, and by contemplating the facts of his career, guided by the Spirit of his God, evolved a theory of morals concerning the highest good for man. He informs us:—"I sought in my heart to lay hold on folly, till I might see what was that good for the sons of men, which they should do under the heaven all the days of their life." He was, in a moral sense, like the magnanimous surgeon, who undergoes painful experiments upon his own body, in order that the knowledge resulting therefrom may be applied to the benefit of the diseased and afflicted. Let no man think, however, to try on himself experiments *à la Solomon*, for he may chance to gain, not repentance, but remorse. No man can plagiarise with impunity the method of learning to be wise through evil courses. No man will be wise to try Solomon's experiments without his genius, and such will no man possess, until God has made another Solomon. This royal genius, and genius royal, gives us a list of all his experiences undertaken in the search after "What was that good for the sons of men which they should do;" of excessive mirth, which he calls madness; of inflaming drink, of which he says it is raging; of sumptuous operations in the arts of architecture, engineering, agriculture, and mining for precious metals, and also of the patronage of music and other kindred delights; and of all these labours of the æsthete, the utilitarian, or the sensualist, which had been to him labours of pleasure, he declared, poising them in the moral balance of comparison of the highest good—"Behold, all was vanity and vexation of spirit, and there was no profit under the sun." Those fleet-winged joys of time were vain and vexatious because they were unsatisfying to the soul's immortal ideal of the highest good. Of those joys he had his pleasure's plethora, yet his soul was empty of content and full of complaint.

"I communed with mine own heart." Yes, and he communicated the results of his self-communings for the benefit of mankind. Like all who approach him nearest in genius he was communicative and not secretive. A cunning man would have hidden his experiences as the hypocrite hides his sin; but this man was too wise to be cunning. He was wise, he did not dissemble nor cloak his sins; no, he confessed them; nor did he confess them in a secretly-whispered prayer only, but he bruited and blazoned them abroad, giving them forth till the whole world was filled with the knowledge of his moral delinquencies, and with the reality of his repentance, as before it had resounded with the fame of his wisdom and glory. He made his proud throne a public pillory, and himself an ever-standing warning to the fools and unrighteous of all times to come. Could wisdom stoop more lowly to depict the grovelling posture of folly? Could folly have had a greater champion, if it were possible to exalt her? Why do cynics so sparingly pelt with ridicule, and so seldom shoot out the lip of sneer at this majesty fallen from so high an estate? Because hypocrisy figured not among his vices, and the grace of candour adorned the lineaments of his character. This man of marvellous moral courage volunteered to go into the public pillory of self-humiliation, and there proclaim himself an example to be avoided of all men, if they would attain the higher good. A Greater than Solomon made Himself a spectacle to angels and men, and in the infinite perfection of His righteousness, and the pure majesty of self-sacrifice, on the pillory of His Cross attained for men, and showed them how to attain, the highest good.

Monarchy can boast that the wisest man was a king; but at the same time it must acknowledge that neither sublimity of intellect, nor grandeur of estate, nor both combined, can save it from submission to the tyranny of temptation, and from sinking under the helotry of vice. A throne must keep allegiance to the rules of righteousness, if it would escape the hap of humiliation, and, by the height of its fall, abase itself lower than the basest under its subjection—lower even than the sycophancy which bows the back to bolster it up. "That were an ignominy and shame."

Solomon's self-communing was not of the sort of one of your hermit philosophers, who write about a world with which they have little consorted, and whose throbbing life-pulse they have seldom felt; who are busy dissecting the body of its dead past while the living present is dying before them. His self-communing was not the brooding pessimism and acrid egotism of the lonely, self-isolated cynic: his chair of study was the seat of judgment; his college, the thronged courts of royalty; his books, the men and women of his time. He was a philosopher who was a man of affairs and busy, not with theories and truisms alone, but with the political and social commerce of his epoch. He writes: "I applied mine heart to know wisdom, and to see the business that is done upon the earth . . . . then I beheld all the work of God, that a man cannot find out the work that is done under the sun; because, though a man labour to seek it out, yet he shall not find it; yea, farther, though a wise man think to know it, yet shall he not be able to find it." The foregoing contains his modest rebuke of philosophic presumption. This greatest scholar of human nature discovered the hard and fast limits to our knowledge of "the business and work of God done under the sun"; the tendency of our secular philosophisers is to think they can know more of things done under the sun, and of things done above that great luminary also, than is given to the mental microscope or telescope of man to discover. He stood in the eye of the world, and the world lay open to his eye; and this man, who with largest outsight could look abroad upon the world, could also look with keenest insight upon the world within himself. These powers of prospection and introspection lifted him, and according to the degree in which we possess them, lift us out of the dust of mere animal existence: they are the motor of our will's responsibility.

Self-introspection, self-communion, is as a mirror, wherein the ego beholds the reflection of itself, and plays the spy upon the secret movements of the soul; it is the keenest detector of furtive faults, and the severest monitor of sly sins. By an earnest habit of self-communion, we can see ourselves more truly than others see us, not by thinking of ourselves what we would like to think, but by that exact and patient self-analysis which separates and examines the various moral parts of which our characters are compounded. Commune with your own heart frequently, if you would learn to know your own self truly. Commune with your own heart, and you will learn the necessity of its closer communion with God, in order that you may gain from Him the wisdom and knowledge necessary to reform and renew its sad estate. "Great estate" had Solomon; for no man had greater before him in Jerusalem, and no man, before him or since, has had greater estate of mind wherewith to rule and order a great estate of material realm: great as it was, it seems too small to use it for a comparison of God's immeasurable estate in the realms of matter and mind, wherewith to rule and order all matter and all minds. And from this plenitude of God His grace to usward springs, and herein we have the means of bringing our self-communing into communion with His infinite consciousness of our entire being, and obtaining from Him the true knowledge of the chemistry of our characters. Can man know himself by his own unaided consciousness? He cannot. But he can find himself out, and his besetting sins and infirmities, by com-

munion with the Divine consciousness, the Spirit of Truth. "Thou hast set our iniquities before thee, our secret sins in the light of Thy countenance" (Ps. xc. 8). The consciousness of God is a sure dwelling-place for the soul of man: "Lord, Thou hast been our dwelling-place in all generations" (Ps. xc. 1). From Him we may obtain an estate in the wisdom of self-knowledge, from Him Solomon obtained one—a grant in perpetuity to share with all posterity. On his knees in prayer he wrestled and fought for it, and his Lord God, as guerdon for his fidelity, granted him seigniory over much wisdom. "Because thou hast asked this thing, and hast not asked for thyself long life, neither hast asked riches for thyself, nor hast asked for thyself the life of thine enemies, but hast asked for thyself understanding to discern judgment, Behold I have done according to thy words. Lo! I have given thee a wise and understanding heart, so that there was none like thee before thee, neither after thee shall any arise like unto thee" (1 Kings iii. 2).

In the possession of the books of Proverbs and Ecclesiastes we have inherited a large share in Solomon's estate of wisdom. He builds his proverbs upon the foundation of the simple and complex experiences of life; and the inspired structure erected upon that foundation is a house of truth, where the wayfarer, struggling with the storm of life, in the darkness of difficulty and doubt, can take refuge and find safety. The structure is not of the hut-and-hutch description, but of a grand, palatial architecture, having all the nobility of the temple edifice. God drew the design of this noble piece of architecture, and the carrying of it out was entrusted to the mind of Solomon. Just as David, his father, had provided him with stores of material wealth for the earthly temple he was commanded to build, so his Heavenly Father appointed him stores of experience in the ways of men and their works under the sun; and, under the sunlight of the Divine presence, the builder reared his stately edifice of moral philosophy, compacted in the serene soliloquy of meditation, in silence reared like his beautiful temple at Jerusalem, and consecrated by the glory of that Divine inspiration which filled the temple of his wisdom.

He taught that the higher good was to be found, not in the natural, but in the spiritual estate of realm, and not to be won nor held save by the sword of the spirit. Direct or implied, such is the sum of all his teaching. Natural things he had tasted, and tested to satiety. And after a lifetime of pleasure, he yearned for the spiritual help of that Almighty Hand which had raised him to the pinnacle of his temporal triumph. Retributive vexation of spirit had followed his illicit indulgences, and slain the zest for innocent joys, till for him the very flowers of life lay withered and dead; for the power to enjoy, which is the root of pleasure, was dead in him. Thus the search after happiness became at last a labour of travail and a vanity of vanities; and out of his disenchanted heart he confesses, "God giveth to a man that is good in His sight, wisdom, and knowledge, and joy; but to the sinner He giveth travail" (Eccles. ii. 26). And, my brethren, experience has shown to every son of sensuality that it skills not what means they may take to make this earth an abode of perpetual pleasure, all their schemes and pursuits shall be tainted with the canker of disappointment, and expire in the agony of vexation of spirit. So felt and sang one, who, gifted with genius, but not graced with "prudent self-control," which he declared to be "wisdom's root," died from the effects of an intemperate pleasure-fit:*—

> "But pleasures are like poppies spread,
> You seize the flower, its bloom is shed;
> Or like the snowflake in the river,
> A moment white, then gone for ever."

The pleasures of life, I mean its amusements and relaxations, are but the flowers, not the fruits of life; the flowers shall lie scattered and withered, when the fruits of righteousness, the tilth and tillage of the highest good, are gathered and garnered in the homestead of God.

Do we seek true happiness? Solomon sought for pleasure:—"I said in mine heart, Go to now, I will prove thee with mirth; therefore enjoy pleasure." But, though he tells us his heart had great experience of wisdom and knowledge, he says not a word about experience of happiness. So his quest for pleasure must have been a forlorn quest for happiness. Do we seek true happiness? If so, our spirits must emigrate to that kingdom which, though in this world, is not of this world, wherein lies the field containing the "treasure hid," the which, when a man hath found, for joy thereof he goes and sells all that he has and buys that field. "I communed with mine own heart, saying, Lo! I am come to great estate." I ask you, and you, and you all, Do you ever commune with your own hearts, saying, Lo, *I* am come to great estate in the kingdom of Jesus Christ;—lo, that kingdom which, if it be not, should be within you? Are you able to say, in the words of the text, "Yea, my heart, hath great experience of wisdom and knowledge"—experience of Him Who is the Wisdom of God and the First Fruits of knowledge? Have your hearts this experience, this knowledge? If you have, you shall obtain your allotted part in the freehold of a spiritual estate unencumbered by vanity and vexation of spirit, to which you are called to be heirs in the everlasting kingdom of Jesus Christ.

Solomon is gone; his wisdom abides, although his abode knows him no more. The lesson of his life and the lore of his philosophy are in the verdure of their vigour still, in this old and ever-ageing world of ours. Where is all his wealth of gold of

* Burns.

Ophir, that overlaid in lavish magnificence his temple of the Lord, and his own palaces of cedar and ivory? Where? Gone, crumbled, ages ago, into the common dust of oblivion—ashes, as the very name of Ophir signifies. But where are his golden grains of priceless Divine knowledge? Here, safe, sterling, and valuable to-day, as when they were mined from the depths of his inspired philosophy and refined in the crucible of his experience and knowledge of good and evil—here, shining and imperishable in the treasure-casket of God's Holy Word.

THE GREAT "IN MEMORIAM."

By Rev. J. REID, Rector.

Sermon Preached in Newtownsaville Church on Sunday, September 4th, 1892.

"For as often as ye eat this bread, and drink this cup, ye do show the Lord's death till He come."—1 Cor. xi. 26.

CORINTH, the chief City of Achia, in Greece, was, owing to its situation, the mart of the ancient world. Wealth flowed into it from all quarters. It was distinguished for luxury and licentiousness, gaiety and fashion, amusement and dissipation. Hence it became a proverb, "It is not for every one to go to Corinth." The Corinthians were especially devoted to the worship of Venus, the goddess of love, who had a temple erected to her honour, about half a mile from the city.

Though so dissipated and corrupt, Corinth was famous for its learning and culture, so that Cicero calls it, "Totius Græciæ lumen," the light of all Greece. St. Paul, in his missionary journeys, visited the city about the year 52, and his visit is thus referred to in Acts xviii. 1, "After these things Paul departed from Athens, and came to Corinth." There he found fellow-labourers in Priscilla and Aquilla, who had lately come from Rome, and soon after he was joined by Silas and Timothy. Then he entered on his great mission in that splendid and dissipated city, where he preached the Gospel for eighteen months, and founded a Christian Church, composed of both Jewish and Gentile converts. His chief opponents were his own countrymen the Jews, who "opposed themselves and blasphemed" (v. 6), and who "made insurrection" against him and brought him before Gallio, the Deputy of Archia (v. 12). Gallio however refused to hear the charge against him, and drove them from the judgment-seat, saying, "I will be no judge of such matters." In consequence of his indifference to and disregard of the clamorous proceedings of Paul's enemies, Gallio has become a type of those who are indifferent to the claims of religion.

Such was the city of Corinth, and such were the elements out of which the first Christian Church there was gathered. I have referred to these things because they throw light upon, and partly account for, the irregularities that crept into the Corinthian Church, such as intemperance, licentiousness, gluttony, and a contentious litigious spirit.

Even the most sacred ordinance of Christianity, the Lord's Supper, had been greatly abused amongst them, and turned into an occasion of unseemly feasting and disorder, as we see by the verses immediately preceding our text (18-22).

These evils St. Paul censures, and reproves them for, and endeavours to correct.

Men of even the strongest minds find it difficult to shake themselves entirely free from the influence of their early training and surroundings.

This accounts, in some measure, for that flavour of intolerance which sometimes mars both the conduct and writings of the Reformers of England, Scotland, and the Continent.

The Corinthian Christians—many of them, at least—had been brought up in heathenism, and under their former modes of worship they had been accustomed to these revels in the feasts and festivals of their deities. Therefore it is the less surprising that some of their former views and habits still clung to them, and were introduced into the observance of even the holiest rite of Christianity, the celebration of the Eucharist.

Besides, perfection cannot be expected at once from those recently converted from heathenism, and unless a careful and constant supervision is exercised over them they are liable to fall into gross errors and irregularities, if not into scandalous offences.

In order to effectually check the evils which had sprung up amongst the Christians at Corinth in connection with the celebration of the Lord's Supper, and bring them back to a proper mode of observing it, the Apostle proceeds, in the 23rd, 24th, and 25th verses, to state particularly its nature and design, as he was taught it by the Lord Jesus: "For I have received of the Lord," he says, "that which I also delivered unto you, That the Lord Jesus, the same night in which he was betrayed, took bread. And when He had given thanks, He brake it, and said, Take, eat: this is My body which is broken for you: this do in remembrance of Me. After the same manner also He took the cup when He had supped, saying, This is the New Testament in My blood: this do as oft as ye drink it in remembrance of Me." And then follow the words of our text: "For as oft as ye eat this bread, and drink this cup, ye do show the Lord's death till He come." Thus he reminds them of the solemn circumstances in which it was instituted, and the design or object in view, namely, to commemorate, or keep up before the Church and the world, a continual remembrance of the Lord Jesus, and especially of His atoning death, and the blessings it has procured for us until His coming again.

In considering this subject of, let us observe, first, the names by which it is called :—

(A.) Communion, as in 1 Cor. x. 16 : "The cup of blessing which we bless, is it not the communion of the blood of Christ, and the bread which we break, is it not the communion of the body of Christ?" The word communion here doubtless refers to that which is common to all Christian people, of which all partake, and in the benefits of which all share alike.

(B.) The second name by which it is designated here, "the Cup of Blessing," refers to the fact that it was blessed by Christ, and that the blessing of God is also invoked upon it in the ordinance, and the cup thus blessed and used is an emblem by which the blood of Christ is exhibited, and we are reminded of "the sacrifice of the death of Christ, and the benefits we receive thereby."

It is also called the Lord's Table and the Lord's Supper. The word table—never altar, as sacerdotal visionaries wish to have it—is in this case used by custom for the provisions spread upon it. It is the table over which God Himself presides, and to which He invites all His children. This idea is beautifully expressed by Dr. Bonar in one of our best Communion Hymns, thus :—

"My God, and is Thy table spread,
And does Thy cup with love o'erflow?
Thither be all Thy children led,
And let them all its sweetness know.

"Hail! sacred feast that Jesus makes,
Rich banquet of His flesh and blood,
Thrice happy he who here partakes
That sacred stream, that heavenly food."

It may here be observed that the word supper (δειπνον) designated the principal meal of the Jews, which was taken toward or in the evening. There may not be much significance in the time when it is celebrated, if done in a right spirit; but it is worthy of notice that it was first observed in the evening of the day, and not as many churches now observe it, in the early part of the day. Whether such a change should be made I do not take on me to decide. Perhaps no fixed rule was intended as to the time of the day when it should be observed, just as no rule was laid down by our Lord or His Apostles as to how often it should be partaken of.

This commemorative ordinance was also designated by various other names in the early Church, as Eucharist, ευχαριστεω (to give thanks), σαναξις (coming together), αγαπη (love feast), μυστηριον (mystery), and θυσια (sacrifice), because it is a sacrifice of praise and thanksgiving, and commemorates the sacrifice of Christ's death, and also because it was and still is in many churches accompanied by a collection and oblation of alms or offerings.

In considering the names applied to this divine ordinance, it may be well also to explain that the word Sacrament is derived from *sacro-are*, or *sacrare*, to make sacred, or dedicate to sacred use, and in its classical usage it denoted that by which any one bound himself to another for the performance of anything, much as we use the word pledge or earnest. Hence it denoted the sum deposited in court as a pledge, and which, if forfeited, was devoted to sacred uses. The word *sacramentum* was also used to signify an oath, especially of a soldier, by which he bound and pledged himself to be faithful to his commander and his country.

The word Sacrament, however, does not occur in the Bible, and no definition of the Lord's Supper can be arrived at merely by the etymology or ecclesiastic usage of the word. In general, definitions of Gospel ordinances can only be arrived at by considering and comparing what the Holy Scriptures teach as to the origin, nature, and design of those ordinances. The origin of the Lord's Supper we have already seen. Its nature we must learn from its component parts and the mode of using them.

In the Church Catechism, the answer to the question, what meanest thou by the word Sacrament is, "An outward and visible sign of an inward and spiritual grace given unto us, ordained by Christ Himself, as a means whereby we receive the same (inward grace) and a pledge to assure us thereof." And the answer to another question declares that the body and blood of Christ are taken and received by the faithful only after an heavenly and spiritual manner, and the means whereby they are taken and received is faith. This is directly opposed to the transubstantiation theory, as it affirms that the body and blood of Christ are received not literally (which they could not be) but spiritually. The Church of Rome erroneously teaches that there is a physical union between the sign and the grace signified by the sign, in the same way as a physical union subsists between a substance and its properties; as, for instance, the virtue of burning is in the fire. Thus, according to them, the grace signified is contained in the very nature of the Sacraments themselves, and is conferred—*ex opere operato*—on all who do not oppose some positive obstacle thereto.

This transubstantiation, or conversion of substance dogma, as our 28th Article says, cannot be proved by Holy Writ, but is "repugnant to the plain word of Scripture overthroweth the nature of a Sacrament, and has given occasion to many superstitions."

It substitutes the priest and his work in place of our great High Priest and His work. It elevates the human and degrades the divine. It contradicts the principles of reason by supposing that our Lord's body can be in several places at the same time, and by maintaining that the body and blood of Christ are really present in the Sacrament, yet without any of their sensible qualities, though

qualities can have no existence apart from the bodies to which they belong.

The Sacrament of the Lord's Supper commemorates Christ's sacrifice upon the Cross, and so cannot be a new propitiatory sacrifice in itself. Besides, a sacrifice implies a priest to offer it, and Christian ministers are not priests, nor is the Christian ministry a priesthood in this sense. The Aaronic priests were types of Christ, and the Aaronic priesthood was completed and fulfilled in Him, and for ever abolished by Him, and consequently no priestly function is ever attributed to any officer of the Church in the New Testament.

Only one priesthood is recognised there, the priesthood of Christ, which renders all other priesthood unnecessary, "By one offering He hath perfected for ever them that are sanctified." Wherefore, as the 31st Article says, "The sacrifices of masses, in which it was commonly said that the priest did offer Christ for the quick and the dead to have remission of pain or guilt, is a blasphemous fable and dangerous deceit." This doctrine of sacerdotalism (from Sacerdos, a priest) has no foundation whatever in Holy Scripture, and receives no sanction from the formularies and authorised standards of our Church, when read and used according to their plain meaning. And when one reads the words "Parish Priest" applied to clergymen of a Protestant Church, one is apt to be confused for the moment as to whether they are reading of the Church of Rome or the Church of England. But if in the Apostles' days some wrested the Holy Scriptures to make them countenance their own views, we need not very much wonder if certain men now wrest the teaching of the Church so as to make it appear to give countenance and support to their ritualistic and Romanising tendencies.

Dishonest men will still be dishonest, no matter by what safeguards you may try to hedge them round, or try to restrain their Romish proclivities. By subtlety, by craft, by evasion, *finesse,* and hairsplitting, they will endeavour to insinuate their pernicious principles, sometimes like the writers of the French Revolution, delicately suggesting and insinuating what it is not convenient to say or do openly. They seem always manœuvring to see how near Rome they can go without entering it. They are somewhat akin to those liberal living Christians, who are always inquiring whether they may not do this and that, and trying as much as possible to obliterate all distinction between the Church and the world, and at the same time "serve God and mammon."

These priestly pretensions are invented to elevate man, but at what a fearful cost, since they blasphemously subject the awful Divinity of our Lord to the control of sinful creatures, who pretend to call Him down from heaven at their own will, and communicate Him to, or withhold Him from, the people as they please. Such sacerdotal pretensions should have no place in a Protestant Church, and if those who make them were honest they would go to Rome at once, instead of temporising, shuffling, and equivocating, eating the Church's bread, while sapping its foundations, and doing the work of its enemies. Honesty we can respect even in an enemy, but double dealing and equivocation are never anything but contemptible.

But as many of the frivolities of the Sacerdotalists in England have been declared by the highest authority to have no doctrinal significance whatever, and can only be practised, if practised at all, with this knowledge, and on this ground, perhaps the wiser course may be to take no notice of them, and thus by "a wise and salutary neglect" they may die of themselves. Since one can hardly imagine wise or sensible men persisting in doing certain things merely for dumb show, which have been declared to mean and signify nothing, and which could not be done if they did mean anything. Notwithstanding all the puerilities practised at their mimic "altars" by a handful of obscure ceremonialists, who may wish to push themselves into notice by religious oddities (or antics), and who perhaps aim at pleasing a weak-minded few who desire to be pleased with such things as children are pleased with toys and pictures, we still cling to the belief expressed years ago by the *Times* that England is Protestant to the core, and this Protestantism, which is very tolerant, if once thoroughly aroused, will make short work with "Mr. Facing-both-ways."

I pass on now to notice the *design* of this sacred ordinance. The intention and purpose of it is to show the Lord's death till He comes. It is a commemorative ordinance. This do in remembrance of Me is the Saviour's own command. "As oft as ye eat this bread, and drink this cup, ye do show the Lord's death till He come." By the bread and wine and our partaking of them, we exhibit the fact in an impressive manner, that Christ died for our sins and our belief in His death. The bread being an emblem of His body wounded for our transgressions and bruised for our iniquities, and the wine representing to us and to the world the precious blood of Christ, by which we have been redeemed, and which both makes an atonement for the soul and cleanses us from all sin.

God has so ordered everything in His infinite wisdom that in obeying His commands we, at the same time, procure blessings for our own souls. Hence in partaking of the Lord's Supper our souls are strengthened and refreshed by Divine grace, conveyed to the souls of all who rightly, worthily, and with faith receive it.

The efficacy, however, does not inhere in it physically as Rome teaches, nor is it due to any inherent supernatural power as Lutherans believe. Nor is it a mere empty sign, or badge of profession, as Socinians teach; nor is its efficacy due to any virtue in him who administers it; nor is there any

such thing as a corporal presence, or anything of a sacrificial nature demanding a priest to offer it. In what, then, does its efficacy consist, or to what is it due? To the presence and operation of the Holy Spirit. There is indeed a real presence in this Sacrament. Christ is truly present in it, not in body, for that is in heaven, but by His spirit and grace. Its power to convey grace and strengthen and refresh the soul depends on the presence and co-operation of the Holy Spirit.

And now I come to the last point I want to discuss. Who should partake of it? or what are the qualifications for worthily receiving it? or, as our Catechism puts it, "What is required of them who come to the Lord's Supper?" First, there is self-examination. "Let a man examine himself," says the Apostle. Not always a pleasant duty, or one that is eagerly undertaken. It is much easier, and often more agreeable to our feelings, to examine others rather than ourselves. But it should be done. True repentance for past sins, and true, or a lively, that is, a living, faith in God's mercy through Christ. Thankfulness to God for His mercy and love, as manifested in Christ's death, and to be in charity with all men.

No doubt the statement in the 29th verse about the danger of eating and drinking unworthily has deterred some from partaking of this holy Sacrament. But there is a great difference between doing anything unworthily, and doing it feeling that we are unworthy to do it. Thus John the Baptist, speaking of the Messiah, said that he himself was unworthy to unloose his shoes. Still he might do it, unworthy though he should be; but to do it unworthily would be to do it with a feeling of contempt and carelessness, and an utter want of respect or reverence. To do a thing unworthily means to do it carelessly, badly, indifferently, without any due sense of its importance. To partake unworthily of the Lord's Supper would mean to treat it lightly or irreverently, without any proper sense of its solemnity or design, as the Corinthians made it an occasion of feasting and intemperance. So when the Apostle says that whosoever shall eat this bread and drink this cup unworthily shall be guilty of the body and blood of the Lord, he means that whosoever treated those emblems of Christ's body and blood with profaneness, irreverence, and contempt would show a spirit similar to that of those who crucified Him, and would incur the indignation and punishment of the Almighty, as some of the Corinthians did. On the other hand, no man, however good or saintly, is worthy of it, since none have any merit in themselves, and the holier men are, the more they feel their unworthiness, just as the purer any substance is the more a spot or stain, however small, will be observed upon it. But though this be so, still the truly humble and penitent, who desire to lead a new life and walk henceforth in His holy ways, are invited by God Himself to come and take this holy Sacrament, however unworthy they may feel themselves of even gathering up the crumbs under His table.

The poor despised publican would not so much as lift up his eyes to heaven, so great and deep was his sense of unworthiness to appear in God's presence. Nevertheless his prayer was heard, and he went away justified and blessed. Thus the Author and Giver of all good fills the hungry with good things, and the rich and self-righteous he sends empty away:

> "Jesus, our great High Priest,
> Has full atonement made."

He was once offered to bear the sins of many, and that offering neither can be nor needs to be repeated. By that one offering He made a full, perfect, and sufficient sacrifice, oblation, and satisfaction for the sins of men. When He comes again the second time, without sin unto salvation, then His people shall see Him and be with Him for ever, and no longer need these emblems to remind them of Him.

"As oft as ye eat this bread." There is, as I have said, no rule laid down as to how often it shall be observed. In the early Church it was observed weekly. Now some observe it monthly, some quarterly, etc., according to their view of what is convenient and edifying. This is a matter that the prudence, wisdom, and love of God's people can arrange for themselves, and therefore they are left free. Thus the observance of this sacred ordinance is commemorative as regards Christ, its Divine Founder, and strengthening and invigorating as regards ourselves. How is it, then, that so many in all our congregations habitually turn their backs upon it? Have they no wish to remember Him, and no desire to grow in grace?

> "Why are its bounties all in vain
> Before unwilling hearts displayed?
> Was not for you the victim slain?
> Are you denied the children's bread?"

No, he invites you, "Come, for all things are now ready."

> "See, the feast of love is spread,
> Drink the wine and break the bread.
> Sweet memorials, till the Lord
> Call us round his heavenly board,
> Some from earth, from glory some,
> Severed only 'till He come!'"

At the monthly meeting of the Church of England Sanitary Association held in the Church House, Westminster, Sir William Vincent, Bart., in the chair, a paper on "The Duty of the Church in Country Places in matters of Health," by Archdeacon Sinclair, was, in his unavoidable absence, read by the Rev. Prebendary Harry Jones. The archdeacon contended that when the Founder of Christianity in the same breath that He said "Preach the word," said also "Heal the sick," "He set before His followers the absolute paramount duty of attending not only to the spiritual condition of those amongst whom they ministered, but also to their social and physical warfare." Votes of thanks to the archdeacon and chairman were spoken to by Gen. Lowry, C.B., Dr. Norman Kerr, the Rev. T. B. Paynter, and the Rev. F. Lawrence.

NOTICES.

All communications respecting the Literary portion of the paper should be addressed to the Editor.

Business communications of every kind should be addressed to Mr. S. GIBBON, at the CHURCH OF ENGLAND PULPIT Office, 160, Fleet Street, London, E.C., to whom cheques and Post-office orders for subscriptions (in advance), three months, 2s., six months, 3s. 6d., twelve months, 6s. 6d., are to be made payable.

The Cases for binding Vol. XXXIV. are now ready.

FOR HEALTH AND IMMORTALITY.

The Ecclesiastical Review.

SATURDAY, FEBRUARY 18, 1893.

CLERGY FEES.

IN the case Charlewood *v.* Foster everybody sympathised with the defendant, though the plaintiff won. A clergyman, incensed at the fashion in which fees are demanded from his brethren at every turn by diocesan officials, accused the secretary to the Bishop of Manchester of extortion, and had to pay damages for libel; the fees were extortionate, but the plaintiff had a right to charge them.

In the present depressed state of clerical incomes this affair of fees is important. It is amazing to find a perfect state of chaos prevailing. There is no rule by which fees are or are not charged. What costs £5 or £6 in one diocese, costs nothing at all in another. There are two ways of taking possession of a benefice, induction and institution; the effect is the same either way, but there is all the difference in cost. In fact, the only principle that seems to prevail is that if there is an official on the spot he pockets a tip; if you can manage to elude him you save your money. Now, is this a proper and dignified state of things?

Furthermore, no two dioceses appear to agree in the number and nature of their officials. In one a couple suffice, in another you have to run the gauntlet of a dozen. In the much-favoured diocese of Manchester, for instance, upon induction to a benefice (perhaps of £100 a year) the archdeacon's official, the archdeacon's registrar, the apparitor, the record-keeper and the sealer (why not whaler?) all five claim fees. And yet this toilsome duty, which requires the united efforts of five men, is performed in the neighbouring diocese of Chester for just nothing at all. Is there anything in the nature of the work at Manchester which necessitates these five supernumeraries, and which did not exist forty years ago when Manchester was included in the diocese of Chester?

For all that, here lies the secret of these fees. There is a tendency to multiply officials in every diocese. Around the bishop there gradually clusters a crowd of secretaries and so forth, who hold office on much the same terms as Dodson and Fogg conducted the affairs of Mrs. Bardell, charging nothing for costs unless they got them out of Mr. Pickwick, that much tried man representing the clergy. This is plainly put by the *Guardian* of 25th of January last in an article on Ecclesiastical Fees, in which the writer calmly justifies them on the score that the diocesan officials are not over-paid. What has that got to do with it? The Church is governed in every diocese by certain lawful officers, bishops, archdeacons, and the like. If these officers require underlings to help them they ought to pay them themselves. Instead of that the absurd principle is laid down that they must be paid for by the parsons. Imagine the logical issue of this contention. Who would for a moment dream of suggesting that the clerical expenses of the War Office or the Admiralty should be raised out of fees exacted from military or naval officers? There is no department of State in which such a plan would be even contemplated. Nay, there are even matters of diocesan administration in which the principle would be seen to be ridiculous. Bishops now-a-days invariably depute the duty of examining candidates for Holy Orders to certain persons called examining chaplains. These are as much officials as any secretary or "apparitor;" they are permanently appointed, and they do a great deal of hard work, demanding special qualifications and unusual skill. But it has not yet been proposed to pay them by levying a tax upon ordination candidates. No doubt that will come.

These fees demanded from the clergy are a survival, not, unhappily, of the fittest, from pre-Reformation days, when it was considered the prime office of a shepherd to shear his sheep, not to say fleece them. The laity have emancipated themselves, but it is still possible to clip the clergy, and clipped they are accordingly. How long will they put up with it is the question? We should think not long now that the absurd injustice of the system has been so clearly stated, and the admission made, for all the world to see, that a principle of administration is applied in the Church which would not be tolerated in one single other department of public affairs.

THE Bishop of Ely has appointed Mr. Albert Gray, M.A., of the Inner Temple, to the office of Chancellor of his diocese, vacant through the resignation of Dr. Isambard Brunel, who has held the office for more than twenty-two years.

SOME *HAPAX LEGOMENA* OF THE PROPHET ISAIAH.

MANY parts of the prophet Isaiah are confessedly difficult to understand. With all the learning and research that have been bestowed on this sublime prophet, very many of his passages are still obscure, and probably ever will remain so. We have little knowledge of how his writings were understood by his contemporaries ; to us after a lapse of nearly twenty-seven centuries they are full of difficulties. To use one of his own eloquent phrases, parts of his writings to us are "darkness, distress, and the light is obscured by the gloomy vapour" (chap. v. 30, Lowth's translation).

The Hebrew ceased to be a spoken language soon after the days of Isaiah. The fulfilment of the very threatenings he was commissioned to proclaim, tended more than anything else to hasten the doom of the Hebrew as a spoken language. The Babylonian captivity sounded its knell, and the Chaldean took its place. But even while it remained a living language it had its provincialisms, its peculiarities of expression and pronunciation. Probably every age had its catch phrases, so that what would be clear to one age, would be an enigma to the next.

Incidentally we come across a peculiarity of pronunciation in a strange manner. When Jephthah was judge, the men of Gilead and of Ephraim had a quarrel ; and, as usual, appealed to the sword. The men of Ephraim were beaten, and in order to escape had to cross the ford of Jordan, but Jephthah placed his men there to intercept them, and in order to find out whether he was an Ephraimite that wished to cross over, they made him say שִׁבֹּלֶת ; but to save his life he could not say this, he could only say סִבֹּלֶת. We are now utterly unable to say what the difference in sound was ; but the men of Gilead at once detected it. It was a dialect or a provincialism which ceased when the language became dead. Of course all this would add to our difficulty in understanding such a man as Isaiah.

Another difficulty is that in the first part he has, besides obscure phrases, many hapax legómena. It is always difficult to determine the exact sense of an hapax legómenon, but when it occurs in the middle of an obscure passage, the difficulty is great indeed, well-nigh insurmountable It is often so in Isaiah. If we can understand the context, we may be able to throw some light on the *a.* λ. ; but if the context is dark, then indeed the *a.* λ. is obscured by the gloomy vapour.

In a lecture on Isaiah I recently heard at the Memorial Hall, Farringdon Street, by Dr. E. White, there was one thing he said to which I could by no means assent—that there is no appreciable difference between the first and second parts of Isaiah. After the lecture I called his attention to this. His answer was that there were as many authorities on the one side as the other. For my own part, I utterly fail to see how any one reading Isaiah through in Hebrew can possibly fail to detect the greatest difference both in the style and in the Hebrew. These hapax legómena are numerous in the first part, together with the most difficult phrases and clauses. In the second part the *a.* λ. are quite exceptional. Indeed, the thought occurs to one sometimes, Did Isaiah himself always know the import of the words he was divinely inspired to write? It was not always that the prophet did. When, for instance, he wrote the prophecy concerning Dumah, which contains only two lines, or that concerning Arabia, which occupies a little over three lines, did he himself fully understand all that was compressed into those few lines? If so, he left a key behind that will open many of his secrets. Some would explain part of them by taking great liberties with the text. This is only cutting the Gordian knot, not untying it. And yet Isaiah did not write to conceal, but to reveal, if we could only get at his meaning. He is indeed a sublime poet. Who ever grouped together images such as he has done? Nothing appears to have escaped his keen eye. In some of his oracles nearly every word is a picture. Whenever since the world began has the imagery of the 14th chapter been excelled, or even equalled? How the shades rise up to meet the fallen King of Babylon ! With what irony do they greet him ! Where, in all the three thousand speeches of Homer, do we meet with such imagery?

Now let us take a few of Isaiah's *hapax legómena*, and see what can be made of them. We do not pretend to make a complete list of them, but as we have seen nothing of the kind attempted, it may be worth while to try. In many cases, at least, we shall learn our utter inability to understand them.

Chapter ix. furnishes us with two hapax legómena, אֻבַּד and עֻתָּם. The first means, apparently, to roll or wind up ; the latter to be scorched or burnt. There is a kindred root in Arabic, *buch*, to entangle, and *aphach*, to turn, Hebrew חָפַךְ. It is used in ix. 17, in the Hithpael : "And shall roll upwards in the mounting up of smoke." "And they shall mount up in volumes of rising smoke" (Lowth). Let us see what light the LXX. and Jerome have to give on the subject : *καὶ συνκαταφάγεται τὰ κύκλῳ τῶν βοῦνων πάντα.* Vulg. : *Et convoluiter in superbia fumi.* The prophet here, as usual in the first part, makes use of a very bold figure. The wicked are compared to thorns and briars ; God's wrath comes down like a fire and destroys them. Like as the dry brushwood, when kindled, rises up in volumes of dark, curling columns of smoke, so shall the wicked be consumed. Both the LXX. and Jerome bear out this view. Much the same figure is used in Psalm xxxvii. 20 : כְּעָשָׁן כָּלוּ "They vanish away like smoke." עֻתָּם occurs in the following verse, and may have been suggested to the prophet by the use of the former *a.* λ., or by the association of ideas, as both belonging to fire. The LXX. renders *συγκέκαυται ἡ γῆ ὅλη.* Jerome : *conturbata est terra.* The LXX. gives the idea of burning ; Jerome that of being troubled. The Arabic *attemo* is "suffocating heat." The Rabbins render, "The land is darkened," but against the context, as in the parallelism we have, "the people is fuel for fire, Our A. V. follows this rendering. But by a well-known rule in Hebrew poetry, which runs in parallelism, the idea is stated in the first clause, and the same idea is varied in the parallel clause. This must be of some help in determining the meaning.

We have another *a.* λ. in chap. xi. 15, עֲיָם in connection with רוּחוֹ ; LXX., *ἐν πνεύματι βιαίῳ.* Vulg. *in fortitudine Spiritus sui.* They agree to render "with His mighty wind." The prophet here again, by a bold anthropomorphism, describes Jehovah as shaking His hand over the Red Sea. The shake creates a strong wind, and dries up the Red Sea.

But the meaning of strong or forcible is only got by conjecture out of this *a.* λ. Gesenius conjectures it should be read עַמָּם. The narrative in Exodus does not help us, as the words there are בְּרוּחַ קָדִים עַזָּה

In xiv. 4, we have מַדְהֵבָה addressed to Babylon. In this ode we have the most magnificent images crowding each other. In none of his writings has Isaiah exceeded this in imagery. In case of this *a.* λ. we are confronted with two solutions, that of Exactress of gold, applied to Babylon, from the Aramean דְּהַב gold, cong. Heb. זָהָב Arabic *dahavo;* and that of oppression, LXX. ἐπισπουδαστής. Vulg. *cessavit exactor, quievit tributum.* Here נֹגֵשׂ and חַזְּהֵבָה are parallel. נָגַשׂ is to urge, impel, drive, and the participle is the word used for the cruel taskmasters of the Israelites in Egypt.

The word parallel to it must then contain the idea of oppressing or exacting. Therefore "oppressor" or "exactress of gold" would also answer to the parallel, as gold is so often exacted with oppression, especially by tyrants. But the "golden city" of the A. V. in no wise answers to the parallelism.

In chap. xviii. 2, we have a *a.* λ. בָּזָא applied to Ethiopia. There is a Chaldee root בְּזַע to cleave. This word appears to have puzzled the translators very much. The LXX. simply ignore it. It must have been in their MSS. and the only various reading is בָּזָה. It gives no sense whatever to the clause: νῦν οἱ ποταμοὶ τῆς γῆς. The Vulg. gives sense: "*Cujus diripuerunt flumina terra ejus,*" but it adds, "*Ad montem nominis Domini exercituum montem Sion.*" This is not in the present Hebrew text or in the Versions. The A. V. renders, "whose land the rivers have spoiled," taking the view of the Vulgate. But Lowth renders: "Whose land the rivers have nourished;" Gesenius: "Whose land the rivers cleave, break up into parts." Both Lowth and Buxtorf take it as an irregular from בָּזַז. But if so, how can it have the meaning of nourishing? Buxtorf is consistent in this, and translates *diripiunt.* If it refers to the Nile and Egypt, it may well be said "whose land the rivers nourish," because Egypt owes everything to the Nile. Lowth tells us that a learned friend suggested to him an explanation that בזא Syr. and ביזא Chal. signifies *uber, manna;* and from this it may come to signify "nourish." And he quotes Seneca: "*Mora atque natura fluminis, quod cum cæteri omnes abluant terras et eviscerent, Nilus tanto cæteris major adeo nihil exedit, nec abradit, ut contra adjiciat vires; miniumque in eo sit, quod solum temperet. Illato enim limo arenas saturat ac jungit; debetque illi Ægyptus non tantum fertilitatem terrarum, sed ipsas.* The A. V. gives as an alternative reading: "Whose land the rivers despise," referring to בָּזַז. A river can only despise a land by not entering there, and leaving it dry and barren; such could not apply to Egypt with its Nile. When a river overflows its banks then it spoils a country, especially the meadow land round about it. The Nile is an exception; when it overflows it nourishes. If, then, this applies to Egypt and the Nile, and if we can obtain the meaning of "nourish" from בזא, this would make excellent sense.

Without going further, the reader will see how difficult it is to render these *hapax legómena.* If they puzzled the translators of the LXX., they may well baffle all modern learning.

When the LXX. was translated the Hebrew had only ceased to be a spoken language a little over 400 years; and it is perfectly credible that they might have had even the original of Isaiah before them. But 2,500 years divide us from the Hebrew as a spoken language. This should teach us very great humility and caution in interpreting parts of Scripture. Who can tell how much a tone of voice, or a gesture may add to the meaning of a word? Or what irony, or jest, or sarcasm may be veiled in a word—perfectly understood when it was uttered, but lost to a generation or two afterwards? Supposing for instance the English language became a dead language now, and that an antiquarian some 2,500 years hence came across a very rare English book—say about the year A.D. 4500. In the book he would notice two *hapax legómena,* "boycott" and "prodger," two verbs. How these two verbs would puzzle him, how he would cudgel his brains for a derivation and a meaning; and afterwards give it up in blank despair. But the words are quite plain to us now. We know their origin and their meaning.

If we talk of the Hebrew as a dead language, this requires to be somewhat modified. It has ceased to be a spoken language, but it is no less a language. Kindred to it are Chaldee, Syriac, Arabic, and to some extent Persian. Can any language that has once been spoken become utterly dead? Will it not pass into other kindred languages, as to its main ideas and words? Abraham came from Ur of the Chaldees. Chaldee must have been his language then. The change from one to the other would not be so very great. What was the language of Eden, that God-taught language? What was the language before the flood? We know not. The earliest names in the Bible are Hebrew, אדם, חוה; but then other nations name these differently; and the Chaldee, Egyptian, Chinese, Indians, Babylonians, and others claim equal antiquity with the Hebrew. Whether all these ancient languages can be traced to a parent stock, the Aryan, is at least *sub judice* quite as much as the question of antiquity. Berosus, writing the early history of the Chaldeans, names the king who reigned before Xisuthrus, in whose days the flood happened, and concludes with the words, "So the sum total of all the kings is ten, and the period which they collectively reigned amounts to 120 sari." A sarus equals 3,600 years. This is only one of the many coincidences of heathen mythology with Scripture. The Biblical number of patriarchs before the flood is ten.

If a man had the age of an antediluvian, and the necessary courage and ability to compare all these ancient languages throughout the different stages of growth and decay, he might be able to form what I may call a *glossometer,* by which we might be able to tell their different ages, changes, etc., and the various factors that caused the changes. But short of the age of an antediluvian we know not how it could be done.

Edlington Rectory. O. F. S. P. JENKINS.

THE Rev. William A. Carroll, B.A. Christ Church, has been appointed priest-in-charge of the Christ Church Oxford Mission, Poplar (St. Frideswide's), in succession to the Rev. and Hon. J. G. Adderley, who has lately resigned. Mr. Carroll was formerly curate at Holy Trinity, Dalston, and at present holds the secretaryship of the Church of England Society of the White Cross League.

CORRESPONDENCE.

To the Editor of the CHURCH OF ENGLAND PULPIT AND ECCLESIASTICAL REVIEW.

THE KINGDOM OF GOD AND OF HEAVEN.

SIR,—Mr. Hobson is mistaken in thinking that I have any anxiety to "make out a point." Rightly or wrongly, I think that there is—nay, must be—a difference in meaning between "the kingdom of God" and "the kingdom of heaven," and I have offered what seems to me an explanation, or what points to one. I have not dogmatised, nor have I "asserted" anything; nor have I "condemned St. Luke by pointing out that a witness at first hand is more likely to be correct than a witness at second hand—a thing which no one that I ever heard of before would think of disputing.

The first, fifth, and sixth of the parables in Matt. xiii. have a very evident reference to the operation of the Holy Spirit and the reign of God over the minds and hearts of men, and no evident reference to "the kingdom of heaven" as an outward organisation upon earth. The second, third, and fourth parables have evidently the converse references. I say "evident," because this is evident to me; if the reverse is evident to another or to others, thinking on the subject may tend to modify their view.

The authorities that Mr. Hobson cites as to the existence of that figment of the brain, an invisible Church, are not so conclusive as he thinks. The quotation from Gregory I. is not to the point at all; for he speaks of the reprobate, who certainly do not belong to the body of Christ, having been cast out of it by its act or by their own. All sinners, even all mortal sinners, are not reprobate. Clemens Alexandrinus is esteemed by many as an equivocal authority, and on this subject the very unsatisfactorily quoted passage in Mr. Hobson's letter, speaking as it does of "the elect," is not conclusive as to the meaning; for what does "the elect" mean? Israel was God's chosen or elect people, and the Church of Christ is, like Israel, an outward organisation on earth, and is God's chosen Israel of the latter time. St. Augustine is an authority among the greatest on philosophical theology; but I think the quotation from him in Mr. Hobson's letter is from "The City of God," a book not to be compared with his other works. As for Bishop Morton, so ignorant was I, that I did not know him as the author of anything but the "Book of Sports."

Your correspondent asks me two questions—one of them in his postscript. "I suppose," he says, "Student" "believes there is such a body as consists of only true Christians, called in our Catechism 'the elect people of God.'" I do; and I read the answer in the Catechism here cited, in connection with the answer to the question, "Who gave you this name?" and in connection with the grace that I believe is conferred in baptism, God the Holy Trinity answering the prayers of the congregation. The other question, that in the postscript, in its mere asking, insinuates that I am an Arian. Christ is God; and the kingdom of Christ is the kingdom of God.

This correspondence gives me no pleasure, and I will not continue it, to be exposed to such a reflection as the above. But I would first ask such of your readers as are not determined to object to anything new put forward for their consideration, the following: Can it be imagined, that when our Lord said to Peter, "I will give unto thee the keys of the kingdom of heaven," He meant the keys of the kingdom of God?

STUDENT.

HYPOCRISIS.

SIR,—The very able and suggestive paper on Hypocrisy, in the PULPIT of yesterday, contains some things with which I must disagree, above all, the saying that "the craving for forgiveness is mere selfishness." Forgiveness, in the Christian sense, is not remission of punishment, but reconciliation with our heavenly Father, and it would be a blessing even if there were no punishment to be feared.

Nor can I approve his saying that "the vision of heaven may be destined to fade away." I can quite understand that a true follower of Christ may feel such a doubt; but he ought not to publish his doubts and perplexities to the world. I am not speaking of unbelievers, with whom I do not confound him.

I think he is wrong also in another matter, which is not directly moral or spiritual, though he would make it so. He so dreads what he calls "artificial speech" in the reading-desk and the pulpit, that he says, "The one rule for the public teacher of religion must ever be to speak out truth, as in the presence of God, to the conscience of man." This is utterly misleading. Public speaking and reading are arts, which, by our race, at least, need to be learned. It is not the fact that right thought will always find right utterance. With some preachers, when they warm with their subject, the voice rises to a scream; with others it breaks down into a jabber; and in either case it is lost to the hearers. I believe, moreover, that a very large part of the preaching among us is rendered totally ineffective by the habit of dropping the voice at the end of a sentence, where it ought to be most distinct; and much of the reading of the service is spoiled through careless ignorance of the use of the voice. I do not mean modulation—which is, perhaps, a special faculty, like music—but rather the right placing of emphasis, which is within the reach of all. Thus, we often—I fear I may say, generally—hear "Have mercy *upon* us, miserable sinners," where the sense requires, "Have mercy upon US, miserable sinners"; and "That she may evermore have AFFIANCE in Thee," where the sense requires "affiance in *Thee*." And in the Communion Service the significance of repeating to every separate communicant the words of administration, "Which was given for THEE." "Which was shed for THEE" is often lost by saying, "Which was GIVEN for thee," "which was SHED for thee." In the reading of Holy Scripture, the effect is perhaps even worse; for instance, "Casting all your care UPON Him, for He careth FOR you"; where the sense requires "Casting all your care upon HIM, for HE careth for YOU." And "He was *wounded* for our *transgressions;* He was *bruised* for our *iniquities;* the chastisement of our *peace* was *upon* Him, and with His *stripes* we are *healed;*" which ought to be, "*He* was *wounded* for *our transgressions*, *He* was *bruised* for *our iniquities;* the chastisement of *our* peace was upon *Him*, and with *His stripes we* are *healed*." Again, the force of the concluding verse of the parable of the Prodigal is often lost by neglecting to emphasise the words *was*

and *is*, "Thy brother *was* dead, and *is* alive again: and *was* lost and *is* found."

These are no trifles. To the poor is the Gospel proclaimed, and those who are the least learned and the least literary in their habits of mind, are the most dependent on the voice of the reader and preacher. It is the minister's duty to cultivate the use of his voice, as of every other providentially conferred talent.

Belfast, February 12th, 1893. M.

PREFERMENTS AND APPOINTMENTS.

Bourne, Rev. H. C., M.A., Vice-Principal of Culham College; Chaplain of All Saints', Dieppe.

Chenevix-Trench, Rev. H. F., M.A.; Commissary for the Bishop of Nyasaland.

Dodd, Rev. Joseph Arthur, M.A., Curate of St. Botolph's, Aldgate; Rector of Lower Heyford, near Oxford.

Duke, Rev. E. H.; Rector of Wickham, Fareham, Hants.

Easterling, Rev. J. M., Assistant British Chaplain at The Hague; Incumbent of St. James's, Guernsey.

Edgell, Rev. R. Arnold, M.A., Senior Assistant-Master at Westminster School; Head Master of Leamington College.

Fox, Rev. W. R., Rector of Gidleigh; Vicar of Clyst Honiton, Devon.

Jephson, Rev. Arthur, W., M.A., Vicar of St. John's, Waterlooroad; Vicar of St. John's, Walworth.

Lewis, Rev. George Guise, Curate; Vicar of Cwmyoy and Llanthoney Abbey, Monmouthshire.

Mitchell, Rev. Harry, M.A., Vicar of Prescott, and Rural Dean; Honorary Canon of Liverpool Cathedral.

Morley, Rev. George, M.A., Vicar of Astwood, Newport Pagnell, Bucks; Warden of Lord Leycester's Hospital, Warwick, and Domestic Chaplain to the Earl of Warwick.

Noot, Rev. W. L. O., M.A., Lecturer of the Parish Church of Bolton; Vicar of St. John's, Pendlebury, Manchester.

Norris, Rev. Charles Leslie, M.A., Rector of St. Thomas-at-Cliffe, Lewes; Surrogate for the Diocese of Chichester.

Peck, Rev. John, English Chaplain at Versailles; English Chaplain at Boulogne-sur-Mer.

Pitman, Rev. Arthur Lane, M.A.; Licensed Preacher in the Diocese of Canterbury.

Proctor, Rev. Francis B., Vicar of Tadcaster; Chaplain of the Tadcaster Union.

Sandford, Rev. Folliott George, M.A., Rector of Holy Trinity, Goodramgate, York; Vicar of St. Andrew's, Sharrow, Sheffield.

CLERICAL OBITUARY.

Bower, Rev. Everard Hollier Spring, late Vicar of Ringland, at Ockbrook, Derby, on the 11th inst., aged 62.

Cardale, Rev. Edward Thomas, formerly Rector of the parish, at Belmont, Uckfield, Sussex, on the 12th inst., aged 82.

Clerk, Rev. David Malcolm, Prebendary of Wells Cathedral and formerly Rector of Kingstone Deverill, at Southbourne-on-Sea, on the 1st inst., aged 84.

Hawkins, Rev. Robert, M.A., for fifty-nine years Vicar of the parish, at the Vicarage, Lamberhurst, on the 9th inst., aged 87.

King, Rev. Watson, M.A., formerly Rector of Croxton, and before that Rector of Plaxtol, at 5, Hanover-road, Tunbridge Wells, on the 8th inst., aged 80.

Morris, Rev. F. O., Rector of Nunburnholme, on the 10th inst., aged 82.

Powell, Rev. Townsend, at Qainton Vicarage, near Stratford-on-Avon, on the 5th inst., aged 45.

Robinson, Rev. Sir Frederick Land, Bart., Rector of Cranford, Northants, at Weldon Rectory, Wansford, on the 6th inst., aged 49.

Slade, Rev. James, Vicar of Little Lever, 1843-1893, on the 3rd inst.

Tottenham, Rev. Robert Loftus, some time Chaplain to H.B.M. Legation, and late Chaplain of Holy Trinity Church, Florence, at Villa Santa Margherita, Florence, on the 5th inst., aged 83.

West, Rev. R. T., M.A., Vicar of St. Mary Magdalene's, Paddington, on the 10th inst.

FIRST REMOVE THE CAUSE.

MEN frequently worry and trouble themselves a great deal in trying to cure the symptoms of vital weakness nervous exhaustion, and kindred ailments, instead of endeavouring to first remove the cause. This can be done by Mr. Harness' Electropathic Treatment without the aid of drugs. It is useless to tell sufferers to employ their minds and bodies in useful work and to forget their disorders, so long as the cause of their troubles is not removed. How can it be expected that when they are fatigued by the least exertion they can occupy themselves by studying, walking, or other exercise? Even in conversation they frequently lose the thread of it and repeatedly find their memory failing them. What can they do? Physic will not cure them—perhaps the leading physicians have fallen to afford them any relief, and they have consequently become hopeless. It is to such as these that Mr. Harness' new combined Electropathic Belt and Suspensory is so strongly recommended, as, by its gentle but continuous action, invigorating electric currents are imperceptibly generated and conveyed direct from the spinal cord to the affected parts. It is this scientifically constructed and convenient appliance which silently but surely acts upon the vital organs, and removes the cause of the patient's disease, effecting a wonderful change in his health, character, and conduct, and speedily enabling him to return to his natural tastes and habits, and enjoy once more the full vigour of youth, with all its accompanying pleasures.

We may add that this perfect Electro-medical appliance is exceedingly comfortable to wear, gives wonderful support and vitality to all the internal organs of the body, prevents chills, imparts new life and vigour to the debilitated constitution, stimulates the organic action, promotes the circulation, assists digestion, and promptly renews that vital energy, the loss of which is the first symptom of decay. Its healing properties are multifarious. It stimulates the functions of various organs, increases their secretions, gives tone to muscle and nerves, relaxes morbid contractions, improves nutrition, and effectually renews exhausted nerve force. Acting directly on the system, it sustains and assists its various functions, and thus promotes the health and vigour of the entire frame. Besides these benefits, the mind is maintained in a buoyant, cheerful state, and every faculty is stimulated to the highest condition of intellectual strength.

Gentlemen who read the above announcement have only to visit London and call at the Electropathic and Zander Institute (52, Oxford Street, W.) to be convinced of the marvellous curative powers of Electricity and Mr. Harness' perfect methods of imperceptibly applying the current. The medical officers of the establishment are in daily attendance, and may by consulted free of charge either personally or by letter.

The Church of England Pulpit.

THE POWER AND THE GLORY.

By Ven. ARCHDEACON FARRAR, D.D.

Sermon Preached in Westminster Abbey on Sunday, January 28th, 1893.

"The power and the glory."—Matt. vi. 13.

ALTHOUGH this Doxology in the Lord's Prayer may only have been an early liturgical addition, and although you will not find it in the Revised Version of your Bible, I trust that none of us will regard it as unnecessary or meaningless. We began with God and we end with God. Christ teaches us to approach God as needy, tempted, guilty creatures. Such, indeed, we are! As needy we require to pray, "Give us our daily bread"; as guilty, "Forgive us our trespasses"; as tempted and imperilled, "Deliver us from evil." But we do not offer these petitions of our human impotence and wretchedness until, losing ourselves in God's infinitude, as a drop is lost in the ocean, we have first offered the universal prayers which entreat the hallowing of God's name, the furtherance of His kingdom, the fulfilment of His will; and when we have added to these the cry of our necessities, we return once more in the Doxology to the acknowledgment of our own nothingness, and confess that the kingdom, the power, and the glory belong only to God. And in all this there is one of life's deepest lessons. The curse and the destruction of our being is the habitual reference of everything to self. What is it which makes the lives of so many millions of men mean and wretched? Is it not because they are the sole suns of their own systems? The universe is to them like that looking-glass in the Castle, which on every side reflects back nothing but their own persons: they fill the air with the clamour of their own egotism, with the fury of their own desires, with the querulousness of their own disappointments. Indeed, until self be cast out of us, and God be suffered to take possession of our hearts, all is lost. It is this which Christ would teach us in the Lord's Prayer, the vision of all things in God, the reference of all things to God, the viewing of every problem of life in the light of God, the conquest of all evil in the strength and by the aid of God. Without God, alienated from God, man loses all that is manly, all that is Divine in his own manhood; he sinks below the beasts that perish, he sells his birthright for a mess of potage, he becomes as the serpen for malignity, as the tiger for fury, as the wolf for greed, as the swine for degradation. Then we may well say, How mean a thing is man! Man with the seven devils in his heart of the seven deadly things is a thing to shudder at and to abhor. Man with Christ in his heart becomes but a little lower than the angels, crowned with glory and honour.

"Thine is the power." "God spake once, and twice I have also heard the same, that power belongeth unto God." Nothing is so absurd as man's pretence to assume independent power, for God's power is visible enough even on this insignificant atom of a globe. When we say: "Thy righteousness standeth like the strong mountains; Thy judgments are like the great deep," we should see enough to show us our own littleness, even on this globe, which is our transient home. Patriarchs and prophets—as you heard in the first lesson of this evening's service—Apostles and evangelists, knowing nothing of the secrets which science has revealed to us, only knowing the beauty and the wonder of this our poor little visible earth in its most superficial aspect, were yet convinced that the invisible things of God, even His eternal power and Godhead, were clearly manifested by the things visible. They needed no further lesson than they could learn from the mountain-peaks that stand ridge beyond ridge, serene in the region of perpetual snow; the summer clouds, images of such mountain-peaks even upon a grander scale, and tinted with more gorgeous colours; the thunder-cloud, with its dazzling bolt; the storm; ocean, with its mountainous waves; the aurora borealis, with its mysterious pillars of fire. All these things, it has been said, are sublime, and elevate the soul, and make it a mighty worker in the elements. To the Psalmist it was sufficient that "the heavens declare the glory of God, and the firmament sheweth His handiwork"; and how much more should the spectacle brand into our souls the nothingness of man now that we know there are five thousand firmaments of starry infinitude, and one hundred millions of fixed stars which are within telescopic range, and that these, as a great writer of science has said, "are but the chips which have flown from the potter's wheel of the great Worker, the sparks which darted from His awful anvil when the solar system lay incandescent, the curls of vapour which rose from the great cauldron of Nature when its elements were separated." Should it not be enough to prove to man the littleness of his independence and the depth of his insignificance to know that though this earth travels in a year four hundred millions of miles round the sun, yet not only his own tiny system, but even the whole stellar galaxy, is probably but an islet in the boundless voyage, a spark in the immense inane, the outermost fringe of an illimitable universe. We talk of space, we live in space, and yet space is a thing not only absolutely indefinable, but absolutely

unthinkable. It is a circle of which the centre is everywhere, and the circumference anywhere. We cannot imagine it as limited by any conceivable boundary, still less can we in any way grasp its endless extension and its ever-widening infinitude. We can but confess that we are creatures of a day, crushed before the moth, and man in himself is but a shadow, less than a shadow, and nothing less than nothing, and the power belongeth unto God. And, as Pascal pointed out, we stand between two infinitudes — there is another infinitely beneath us; it does not need the starry heavens above to prove God's omnipotence. The philosopher Vanini, when imprisoned on a false charge of atheism, touched a straw in his dungeon with his feet, and said that from that very straw he could prove the omnipotence of God. Atheism stands branded with fatuity. As much in every water-drop as in every tuft of moss, the least of God's works is as infinitely beyond the reach of our cognisance as is the greatest. What, then, is man? One ticking of the clock between two gulfs of eternal silence, one atom suspended between the two abysses of infinitude, and nothing else. In this vast fatuity of incomprehensible being even his imagination drops down, fluttering her pinions, and man shows himself to be but an animalcule in the illimitable ocean —a mote in the faultless glory, a flutter in the eternal calm.

Is there no lesson but curiosity in all this? There is this lesson, that there can be no effort so futile as the attempt to resist the will of God, and no infatuation so insensate as to kindle His displeasure; for, if reason reveals to us His dread magnificence, conscience no less whispers to us His revealed will. The physical Creator of the universe is the moral governor of the world. Pitying man's abjectness apart from His maker, God gave him, it has been said, those two great archangels of reason and conscience to lead him along the path of safety. Reason and conscience, those two ministers of His who expound His purposes, who do His bidding—these two great archangels are sent to every soul of man to conduct our course, attending us on the right hand and on the left, walking by our sides with tranquil and steadfast countenances, with grave and measured steps, but making us feel that we may not deviate or step aside, lest they should turn on us their intolerable looks of calm yet awful indignation. "Thine is the power;" therefore it is utter madness for man to do anything but walk humbly before God, with that obedience in which alone lies for every man the path of happiness and the path of safety.

"Thine is the power and Thine is the *glory*." That seems to me much more difficult to understand, for God is so infinite that nothing which we call human glory, can furnish any sort of analogy to His; we must go back again to the primary idea of the word glory, which is light and splendour. And not only does God cover Himself with light, but God is light. When we say, "Thine is the glory," we mean that without God the physical world would sink into a chaos of darkness, and the moral world into an abyss of crime. In a starless night all is black, but from the moment that the dawn has kindled its first beacon light of vivid crimson on the ice-clad mountain-peaks, it fires summit after summit with splendour, and flows down the sides of the hills in rivers of molten gold, the streams flash into silver, the sea burns under a flood of radiance, the fields burst into colour, and the forest trees and the dewy flowers gleam with millions of diamonds; the whole world thrills and burns with lustre and with life. Like that is the glory of God—God is light. He is that light, bodiless and impalpable, from whose unemptyable fountains our earthly light is but a faint spark or a dim shadow; and in God's heaven, as you heard in the second lesson for this evening, there shall be no night, they need no lamp, neither light of the sun, for the Lord God giveth them light. And that is why Dante, in his great poem, describes Paradise as one sea of light. Their wings of gold, their robes white as snow, their faces radiant as pure flame, the angels and the blessed spirits in multitudes of splendour, like living topazes or living rubies, move ever around the Throne of Him who dwelleth there for Eternity, whose fountains who shall tell?

And is there no lesson for us, again, in this our acknowledgment of the glory of God? There is this most searching lesson, if we will learn it—the earthly correlative to God is light. Let us walk in the light, be ye sons of light, bring forth the fruits of light, cast away the works of darkness, and put on the armour of light. God knows the most hidden secrets of the heart; no concealments are possible with Him; He readeth the inmost thoughts; all things are naked and open before the eyes of Him with whom we have to do. All Christianity lies in that—God is light, and darkness there is not in Him, no, not in any way, and in Christ God manifested Himself to us. And Christ said, "I am the Light of the world; walk as ye have the light, that ye may become sons of light." What is a jewel in the midnight? It is a cold chip of worthless stone; but let light fall on it, and what happens? Let me borrow the words of that great beloved American bishop, whom to our great grief Christ has called away at a time, it seems to us, who know nothing, so untimely, when to us his influence seemed to be so immensely necessary both in the American and in the English Church—let me borrow the words of that great and good man, whose voice, alas! will not be heard in this place any more. He says: "Let the light fall upon the jewel, and you then see for the first time the jewel as it is; you see depth opening depth, until it looks as if there were no end to the chambers of splendour that are shut up in that little stone. You see flake after flake of luminous

colour floating up out of the unseen fountain which lies somewhere in the jewel's heart." So it is with our human souls. If our souls are untouched by the transforming light, of course they are dull and vile; but when the light of God shines on them, they will be changed from dullness to glory. It is worse than vain for us to talk about God's glory if we are living and loving the works of shame. If our life grovels in the charnel-house of death and darkness, then for us the light has shone in vain. If we would become partakers of God's glory, there must be in us no subterfuges, no duplicity, no dishonest and guilty concealments, no hidden places full of sin and shame in the back places of our life, no secret chambers of unclean imagery, no two lives in one, no wilful self-deceit and self-delusion, no mask of hypocrisy, no base secondary motives, nothing Jesuitical, no subterranean myths, no manipulations of truth or of doctrine, no suppression of truth, no suggestions of falsehood, no vile pretences of doing evil that good may come. Oh, man, wouldest thou have a share in the glory of God, then thou must be open as the sunlight, transparent, simple, sincere, guileless, pure, with no guilty secrets at which to blush, with no dark spectres haunting the secret chambers of thy life.

"Thine is the power and Thine is the glory." My friends, in conclusion, it is Christ alone who can reconcile us with that Power whose laws we have offended, and give us back the image of that glory which we have defiled. A German poet, in his vision, was carried into the illimitable zones of worlds, the earth fell back in the abyss of distance, heaven after heaven, galaxy after galaxy in the starry wilderness, unfurled before him their innumerable banners, and were left behind him in the infinite abyss; and as he sped in his dream through vast seas of vacuity and belts of unfathomable blackness and new cycles of worlds, till his whole soul was terrified within him, lo! from the depths came floating to him a sea of light, and on it was a thorn-crowned child, "and lo," he says, "I saw that that planet was earth, and the child was the child Jesus. He had come forth to comfort me in the racking of these immensities, and He threw on me a look of gentlest pity and unutterable love. Then in my heart I felt a sudden rapture of joy which passed all understanding, and in the tumult of that happiness I awoke, and thanked God for life."

My friends, in Christ alone shall we apprehend the power and the glory of God, in His life alone can we see life. Oh! that each soul here which is now sitting in darkness and the valley of the shadow of death would hear His call: "Arise, shine, for thy light is come."

In Canterbury Cathedral on Wednesday (8th inst.), the Hon. and Rev. R. Adderley, late vicar of Chesterfield, was installed as Tait Missioner for the diocese of Canterbury.

HEALTH PRESERVATION: A RELIGIOUS PRESCRIPTION.

By the Rev. JOHN NAPLETON, sometime Rector of Wymington.

The Substance of a Sermon Preached on Septuagesima Sunday, 1893.

"The Lord God formed man of the dust of the ground, and breathed into his nostrils the breath of life; and man became a living soul."—Gen. ii. 7.

THIS season of Septuagesima points to the old and the new creation; but it does not stop there. Even as the first shall be absorbed in and replaced by the second, so shall our natural life, the life we now live in the flesh, give place to the higher, nobler state, the life which knows no ending. The death unto sin shall be followed by the life unto righteousness, and the corruptible elements being cast aside, the natural shall be exchanged for the spiritual body. If, as we are told, the Lord God rejoiced in His work, and said of everything that He had made that it was very good, so too must the whole creation rejoice when it realises the object of its original being—to live, that is, in the perfect enjoyment of "Him who formed it first," and consciously or unconsciously give utterance to the exclamation of supreme contentment and joyfulness: "God, Thou art great. Bless the Lord, O my soul, and all that is within me praise His holy name." At this season the whole Church delights to raise her voice in glad acclaim: "O all ye works of the Lord: bless ye the Lord, praise Him and magnify Him for ever!" "The Lord God formed man of the dust," that is to say, his bodily part, "and man became a living soul." The body was frail, capable of being dissolved and turning to corruption if it should be guilty of disobedience. The soul could never die, since it contained the essence of life, imparted by the Lord and Giver of life. In a body pure and free from the poison of sin the soul might thrive and rise heavenward, imparting its own undyingness to its material framework; but when once death had touched it, that polluted body must drag down and stifle the workings of the spirit life within it. Thus, then, it fell out that when death passed upon Adam and his seed, and was first accomplished through the unlovely jealousy of Cain, the truth of the prediction was brought home to the human race: "The seed of the woman shall bruise thy head, and thou shalt bruise his heel." The typical forecast of the Redeemer's bloodshedding was written upon the earth in letters of blood. The same earth was dyed with Abel's blood, crying for vengeance, as was destined to be dyed with the blood that cried for our pardon in Christ, the sacred victim slain to bless us. That last blood of sacrifice was destined to impart to our souls and to our spiritual bodies the true seed of immortal, everlasting life. The

body of Christ, His flesh and His blood, were perfectly pure, and it is in that living stream that we are to be cleansed before we cast off the "filthy rags," the "vile clothing," of our own fancied worthiness, to receive in its stead the garment which, from its entire spotlessness, can alone entitle us to be admitted to the marriage supper of the Lamb:—

> "Jesus, Thy blood and righteousness
> My beauty are, my glorious dress!"

Can you not then perceive what vital importance ought to be attached by us as to the keeping under of our body, and bringing it into subjection, as says St. Paul in to-day's Epistle? This is not merely a devotional or ascetic work, but one which calls into play the fullest energies of our undiminished physical and mental powers. From the time of Moses, if not earlier, a distinct and explicit code of sanitary precautions was laid down for the guidance of God's people, and obviously the principles involved in this primitive system must continue to be operative as long as human nature lasts. I would this evening call your attention briefly to the three branches of bodily and mental culture, which are incumbent upon us all so far as in us lies, not merely for our own individual sakes, but also for the benefit of the community at large. And, first of all, that which is more distinctly a moral exercise, as hinted by the Apostle, namely, the due restraint and subjection of the passions. If we allow these to conquer our will, we become slaves, and not only is the mind perturbed and unbalanced but the brain is excited, and through it the whole nervous system is upset. "Suicide through temporary insanitary!" How often this verdict is due to the riotous turmoil of what were at first only ungoverned, but at last became ungovernable passions! How much of the neuralgia and spasmodic complaints which crowd the history of our family circles in this highly strung age spring from the same cause! But apart from the evils produced by giving the rein to our passions, there is no limit to the disease and death incurred through neglect of even the simplest medical treatment in cases of accident and disease. Did we know thoroughly the exact and complete laws ruling our physical and mental nature, we should be more careful not to misuse or abuse their workings, and we might live in comparative freedom from pain and infirmity. But the more the true science of healing advances, and the greater is the surgical and medicinal skill attained, the greater will be the benefit conferred upon the race. Little or nothing is known of many valuable agencies for the cure of disease; but even of those we do possess and understand, it may be but too truly said that the ignorance in the generality of people is simply culpable, and they suffer only too frequently from prejudice and a dread of "doctoring." Nature is inexorable. She never forgives a wilful breach of her laws, nor excuses an inadvertent blunder, whilst a flagrant abuse of her prescriptions is visited with the vengeance of torture and cruel agony. The more care we take therefore in sickness and disease, the better in every way for us. The constitution will become stronger and more fitted to resist external injuries, and the race will be improved in those that are as yet unborn. Health regained is the next best thing to health unimpaired, and be sure that the greater relief you can give to the body, the clearer the mind is allowed to work, so much the better will you be able to appreciate the true character of your spiritual nature, and to rise above the carnal cravings of fallen humanity.

There is yet another duty which Moses enforced in the plainest language. We mean the observance of the laws of sanitation, which embrace the prevention of suffering, by using nature's means to preserve our health and destroy the germs of disease. How proud the faculty are of their statistics of longevity during our own time as compared with the past! And no doubt justly so; for if it were not that the laws of health were better explained and understood than they used to be, the "Plague of London," as it was called more than two centuries ago, would have been as nothing compared to the pestilence that would destroy in the noonday of 1893, preying with terrible relentlessness upon the lives of our teeming cities and badly-drained villages. Over and over again this country might have been smitten with the cholera imported last year from Hamburg, but for the vigilance displayed by the quarantine officials at the port of Southampton. Again, what ill-favour the country parson meets with when, in the exercise of common humanity, and in the cause of decency, if for no other reasons, he calls attention to the utter want of all sanitary precautions so remarkable in many places, whereas it is at least an act of kindness to warn against what would be dealt with severely by the local inspector of nuisances. Once more. We must point out that the laws of health are not, and ought not to be confined to the living, but apply with startling seriousness to the dead likewise. How often, nay, how seldom, are those words literally true and possible which we utter at the graveside: "Earth to earth, ashes to ashes, dust to dust?" How can they be when the remains are enclosed in a ponderous leaden coffin, or even a thick wooden one, from which all possibility of decomposition and resolution into the original element are strenuously excluded? In this country it is bad enough; but those who have travelled abroad meet with still more appalling scenes. I have myself seen in the pauper side of a foreign cemetery, portions of human bodies mangled and cast hither and thither without the slightest compunction. If earth-to-earth burial were adopted there would be time before such graves were reopened for the dissolution of the remains, and thus the feelings of the living would not be

harrowed, nor their lives endangered through such irreverence and indecency.

In England, too, we often hear of overcrowded churchyards and cemeteries, which are fruitful nurseries of infection. To remedy these evils in the physical, moral, and spiritual interests of society, and especially of Church people, there has existed for some years past what is known as the Church of England Burial Reform Association, which disseminates the true and Scriptural principle of natural burial, and the sanitary rules affecting the dying and the dead. It also discourages the pompous and expensive funerals which are but a relic of heathendom, and benefit no one but the undertaker. In preference to the unnecessarily protracted preservation of decaying animal matter, we are bound to say that its destruction by fire is vastly to be preferred. We commit bodies to the deep, why not to the flames? Speaking on this subject, I was once reminded by a former dignitary of the Church that our Lord was "crucified, dead, and buried." My reply was that our Lord's body "saw no corruption," and that fire is repeatedly spoken of in the Old and New Testaments as a purifying agent. We have no need to preserve the relics of our miserable mortality, of our corruption and our sin, for "this mortal must put on immortality." It is the *new* creation for which we groan and travail. "We shall be changed." "The same, yet not the same." "Thou sowest not that body that shall be." Oh, let us remember that it is by grace we are saved, and that there is room in God's creation not only for Adam the sinner and his seed, but for the infinitely higher seed of the second Adam, who hath saved us by His blood, and shall bring us, together with the ten thousand times ten thousand of the ransomed ones, into His glorious house above. In the words we have just sung:—

> "There is grace enough for thousands
> Of new worlds as great as this;
> There is room for fresh creations
> In that upper home of bliss."

Our bodies and our souls are now united; let us, therefore, keep the laws of our being, and so not incur loss to either through neglecting the means for working out the final salvation of both.

THE Rev. H. F. Chevenix-Trench has been appointed commissary to Bishop Hornby, of Nyasaland.

THE Dean of Llandaff (Dr. Vaughan) is, it is stated, making satisfactory progress towards convalescence.

THE Rev. Leonard C. Wood, vicar of Great Singleton, near Preston, commemorates this year his jubilee as vicar of his Fylde parish. For many years, says the *Manchester Guardian*, Mr. Wood has taken a keen interest and active part in the agricultural welfare of North Lancashire in general and the Fylde district in particular.

NOTICES.

All communications respecting the Literary portion of the paper should be addressed to the Editor.

Business communications of every kind should be addressed to Mr. S. GIBBON. at the CHURCH OF ENGLAND PULPIT Office, 160, Fleet Street, London, E.C., to whom cheques and Post-office orders for subscriptions (in advance), three months, 2s., six months, 3s. 6d., twelve months, 6s. 6d., are to be made payable.

The Cases for binding Vol. XXXIV. are now ready.

FOR HEALTH AND IMMORTALITY.

The Ecclesiastical Review.

SATURDAY, FEBRUARY 25, 1893.

HERE WE ARE AGAIN.

THE great political harlequin is back again with his famous Bill. Once more we are face to face with Home Rule for Ireland, and its concomitant innovations in the British Constitution, and in representative government generally. This is not the place to discuss the details of the Bill, which indeed has already been riddled, but we may have a word or two concerning it nevertheless.

What are the prospects of the Church and of education under Mr. Gladstone's Bill? That is the question of supreme interest to Protestants. We do not concern ourselves with the unworkable and impossible features of it. It is quite clear that if Home Rule becomes an accomplished fact on Mr. Gladstone's lines, Roman Catholic domination will follow. Not by express permission, but by indirect use of opportunities provided, we almost suspect, for that very purpose. It is indeed provided that the Irish Parliament shall not establish or endow any Church, but they are left with absolute power to do this by side winds; and since those responsible for the administration are to be the very men who would, if they could, establish and endow the Romish Church, it is easy to see that they will not rigidly insist on more than the letter of the law. Under various pretences sisterhoods, colleges, convents will arise, and the Roman Catholic clergy will reap all the advantage and prestige of establishment without the doubtful privilege of the title. That this can and probably will happen is the deliberate opinion of so shrewd a judge as Mr. Chamberlain, and with the evidence before our eyes of what a determined and unscrupulous hierarchy has already been able to

accomplish in Ireland, who can doubt that he is right?

And here let us add that it is small consolation to receive Mr. Morley's consoling assurance that the Irish are not likely to remain under the thumb of the priest. They are under it now, at all events. Doubtless they will revolt in time, but that is no comfort to Protestants. When Protestantism has been crushed in Ireland, it will avail little that Romanism will, in its turn, go to the wall. Poetical justice will be satisfied, but it is small profit to the victim that, in fulness of time, his murderer will be hanged. That will not bring him back to life. However long or however short is the priestly triumph, it will be long enough to ruin Irish Protestantism. That is our concern; and that is what all English Protestants, of whatever denomination, ought to understand. It is a heartrending spectacle to see men who claim to be especially representative of the principles of the Reformation induced by sectarian jealousy to strenuously support a movement which must turn out to be entirely subversive of those principles. And yet this is the case to-day all over England.

In the matter of education the Roman Catholics will have an easy task. They can, and from the state of things in Meath, we may be pretty certain they will procure the election of priests in all cases as school managers, and almost the entire youth of Ireland will be in their hands. It is a dazzling prospect, and one they will assuredly spare no pains to realise. In fact, there is no country in Europe which offers such a splendid opportunity to the Roman Catholic Church as Ireland under this Bill. Almost unlimited influence in the councils of state, establishment and endowment in all but name, virtual control of education, the Vatican may find in Ireland a not altogether inadequate compensation for the loss of Rome. It is true, it might not last; the Irishman is shrewd, and is quite as likely to use his priest as to be used by him. But it will last long enough to inflict a deadly wound upon Protestantism in the British Islands. It behoves all those who stand by the Reformation, whatever their political aspirations may be, to seriously consider whether any party advantage is worth taking this backward step, with its tremendous consequences.

THE IRISH HOME RULE BILL.

ALTHOUGH Mr. Gladstone has expounded this Bill in the Imperial Parliament, and more light than he likes has been cast upon it from the Opposition benches, yet the Bill being now in black and white may be analysed with more precision than before. The Bill, indeed, disclaims any "impairing or restricting the supreme authority of Parliament." But it might do something else, no less fatal to that "supreme authority," on some other lines of procedure, say, by dividing it. Any way, "a Bill to amend the provision for the government of Ireland," as hitherto carried out, must involve enormous changes, and with these some probable risks and certain perils. To say there is "no fear" does not prove there is "no danger." Before entering into any details of the measure, it is only just and reasonable to take a glance at the condition of affairs in Ireland in view of which this Bill is prepared to become operative law. In the Castlereagh memoirs it is disclosed that the Irish Roman Catholic Peers, Bishops, and others—in fact the leaders of the Irish party—petitioned that an incorporating union be consummated, in order that they might be relieved from the intolerable burden of the dominant local Protestant party then supreme. Now, when they themselves demand and are to obtain a supremacy for the dominant Papal party in Ireland over their prostrate foes, what else do they seek but to turn the tables and be able to inflict upon others what they would not endure themselves. Again, one must estimate the value of the proposed safeguards and "restrictions" in the light of what this same party has done by those which bristled in the Emancipation Act. For this, we take no more than the case of Monastic institutions.

In England these have multiplied enormously since 1829. In Ireland, although Mr. O'Connell declared in "his opinion in 1844" that "the situation of the regular clergy is rendered by the Charitable Donations Bill in many respects worse, and in all more precarious than it was under the Emancipation Act," yet they held their ground and have gone a-head until these institutions are become a sore burden and heavy drain upon the resources of the Roman Catholic population. So far for safeguards and their validity. Then, further, the Parnell Commission has revealed the high state of discipline which the forces of lawlessness have reached, and that the parish has become the unit and the village-club the organ of activity in the crusade against "the English garrison." The open threats of the Nationalist members as to what they will not do are but the scant measure of their animosity, and an unmistakable echo of these resounds from Clapham, where Mr. Gladstone pronounced the landlords and loyalists "the curse of Ireland, which had inscribed upon the face of history the blackest and deepest stain that anywhere at any time has attached to England." Of course these must now be exterminated like wolves.

The recent elections in Meath are not without the lesson, that the Roman Catholic bishops, as officers of a foreign Power, are to control the voters of the electoral divisions. And this is no new wonder but the normal condition of relations between Church and State in Ireland, and must continue and increase for use in a Dublin Parliament, to augment "the Pope's Brass Band" on College Green. To add no more out of the abundance of suggestive facts predominant in Ireland, the Committee of the Irish Parliamentary Party open a begging letter to Americans with the declaration that "the Bill offers to the Irish people (that is themselves supposed such) a Parliament practically free to deal with all Ireland's local affairs and an executive government responsible to that Parliament." It is added that "the representatives of Ireland have accepted without hesitation the constitution proposed in this Bill"; and "this settlement of 1893 increases Ireland's place in the government of the world no less." And surely, the Mathews' Committee and the Morley escapades must be added to exhibit the "coming events, which cast their shadows before."

Nor would it be fair to leave out the candid statements of Mr. Parnell and Mr. Redmond, that there is no finality here but the successors are free to go further still, while the present concession, or rather submission to the forces of disorder, must be taken as an instalment of "justice to Ireland." Such being a rapid diagnosis of the case and its chief symptoms, one may the better estimate the method of treatment proposed, and the nature of the ingredients to be applied.

In estimating this proposal, one is struck at once by its identity in its chief features with the methods used in Ireland during the sad reign, or rather invasion, of King James the Second. Of course, there is the fundamental difference that he acted on the principle, so dear to him, and so disastrous as well, of the absolutism of the Sovereign and of the passive obedience of the subject. But it remains to be proved that the absolutism of the Parliament and the abject submission of the subject are not here involved and set to work again. If this cannot be proved, then the people of Ireland, who do not want to become subjects of a new power have a right to stand on the constitution, and prove their loyalty to the Queen and to it at all hazards. King James's administration and legislation were pronounced in their independence and separation from England. The isolation was complete. Let any fair observer, then, judge how far the proposal does not, in practice and in effect, run on the same lines. Any "impairing or restricting of the authority of Parliament" is disclaimed, and the unity of this authority is proclaimed. What then? Parliament is to be one body, but with two heads. Now this sort of a thing is a curiosity, nay, a monstrosity. In actual life, specimens are only seen in surgical museums, preserved in bottles of spirits of wine. There is also the like exhibited in the national heraldic emblem of the Austro-Hungarian kingdom; and a very fit emblem it is, significant of their mutual relations, which are marked by the one head of the eagle constantly pecking at the other, and while not busy at this sort of cock-fighting, each one snatching the food out of the mouth of the other. But in the section on "British and Irish business," we find that "Irish representative peers" are not to be as yet abolished, but their action in the Upper, as of Irish members in the Lower House, is to be curtailed, and "not be entitled to deliberate or vote on any Bill in relation thereto, the operation of which Bill is confined to Great Britain or some part thereof." What the words "Great Britain" mean in law technicality may be a question; but why may not the Irish members call the Bill one relating to Ireland, just as Lever tells so pleasantly of the priest in Milton Malbury, who called the corned shoulder of mutton, served up on the fast day, a turbot? On Imperial questions there is a restriction put on the Irish members while in the Dublin Parliament, but none upon them while in the London Parliament; and thus these members are in a position to turn out ministries or put in ministries on questions of foreign policy, of peace and war—vital points indeed.

A spiteful clause enacts that "Dublin University shall cease to return any member"; and thus, while the nominee of the *sans culotte* and the *soutane* is to have vote and voice, the splendid eloquence of learned and most able public men in succession to the Lefroys, the Shaws, the Napiers, the Whitesides, the Plunkets, and the Carsons, is no longer to charm and sway the British Senate. Can there be a doubt now of the intolerant object of this malignant measure?

The Irish members, of course, are agile enough to overcome another difficulty, by being in two places at once. Well, saints are recorded to have "bilocated"; any way they may embark on the back or grip the tail of Sir Boyle Roche's bird, and so escape the race of Holyhead. "The Irish Parliament is to have no power" in certain specified cases; among the rest, "to make laws in respect of treason, treason felony, alienage, or naturalisation." Good! but it remains to be seen what its Judges will determine in these cases, and whether its administrative officers are not to allow a head centre to break jail, or give early notice to a rebel who is "wanted" by the police.

And here two notable instances occur of the identity of the new Irish régime with that of King James. Only the Irish Supreme and Superior Court Judges are to be appointed by the Queen for six years, and after this comes the deluge of Irish-made and Parliament-mastered, "removable-on-address" Judges, except "two in the Exchequer Court," for obvious English fiscal reasons; also for hapless election petition cases, and not for any general fair play in this branch of justice. And so King James dealt with the Courts of Judicature in like manner, by turning out persons fit to support the kingdom and do righteously between man and man, and then by putting in their stead hands most unfit for this, such as were the corrupt Fitton, the partial Nugent, the virulent Rice, the insidious Nagle, *et hoc genus omne*. As to the County Court Judges and the resident magistrates, it is ordained, under the head, we presume, of "the civil service"—and if not, where else?—that "all existing officers in the permanent civil service of the Crown shall continue, etc., and until three years after the passing of this Act their salaries, etc, may be paid to the payees. Any such officer, after three years from the passing, may retire, and shall at any time during those three, if required by the Irish Government, retire on pension," after he gets his dirty turn out.

But we cannot pass over the Irish post-office and savings banks. These, "from the appointed day, shall be transferred to the Irish Government and regulated by Irish Act. But the Treasury shall notify depositors and trustees to change their accounts to England, if they so elect—as they assuredly ought, with a beggarly public service ready to clutch their savings. But the post-office, as in King James's days, so again, may prove a happy hunting-ground to scent out suspected loyalists and tap their secrets. Again, as King James, through Tyrconnel, dealt with the army, so Mr. Gladstone deals with the police. Seven thousand most loyal men were disbanded, and they were able to escape, through charity, to Holland, where they laid their complaint before King William. Our new King William, meantime, ordains that the forces of the Royal Irish Police and the Dublin Irish Police shall, when and as local police forces are, from time to time, established in Ireland, be gradually reduced and cease to exist; and after the passing of this Act no officer or man shall be appointed to either of these forces. Provided that," etc.

Here one must mark the invidious contrast of the treatment meted out to the Church in Wales, suspended by anticipation and widowed in a hurry. This is to catch the Welsh vote. But to proceed to legislation. King James, after leaving Derry, called his Dublin Parliament, which made itself and him eternally infamous for two Acts. The one was the repeal of the Acts of Settlement and Explanation, the other was the Act of Attainder. By the first he swept away

the real property of old and new proprietors alike ; by the second were proscribed, with a vengeance never outdone in Rome or in France, 2,445 of the most eminent personages in and of Ireland, male and female alike. But the infamy due to this legislation must not condone or cause oblivion of the other infamies of administration carried out prior to this, through the army, through the disbanded forces, through the Rapparees and their vulture-like wives, and finally by Rosen's driving of some 5,000 to 7,000 Protestants under the walls of Derry.

We now consider this climax of Gladstonian legislation and provisional administration, worked by the new executive and without any more being organised in it, or any "volunteers" being allowed under formal enrolment. "The restrictions of the Irish Parliament extend to the making of laws in respect to" some seven items. The fifth is our pet abomination, and here it is. "In respect to any law, whereby any person may be deprived of life, liberty, or property, without due process of law, or may be denied the equal protection of the laws, or whereby private property may be taken away without just compensation." Now here is the "restriction" put on the Irish Parliament in terms by Mr. Gladstone, and does he not thereby inform them and all concerned that he looks upon them as capable of enacting laws equal to, or outtopping in enormity, the laws enacted in James's Dublin Parliament which have no place in the Statute Book. Yes, these men, these Ex and Anti-Parnellites he tells to their teeth, and nails over their doors (as though their Parliament was but the cave of Cacus), a significant restriction, founded on a sad experience in the past and at the present—a restriction damning all round, and not least himself—that their legislation is not to be murderous, not to be rapacious, not to be aggressive, not to be iniquitous, because themselves are so inhuman, so demoralised, and so anti social in heart and hand. But they must restrain themselves and turn over a new leaf if they want their acts to pass as valid and run as law. And yet what hopeless defence or security is in all this, that so reminds us of the serpent charmer, cutting the poison gland out of his Ophidean performers before he exhibits them in public. Just as if these men would go to the trouble to make and print and publish *laws* for the accomplishment of their fell projects. They are "a law unto themselves," and their well organised subordinates and supporters are in full harmony with them. Yes, as they say themselves, "*Theige und Thu.*" Tim understands Tom, Oh, yes, that he does, and only wants "the tip of a wink" and "the wind of the word" to carry out aught, as vile, as bloody, as cowardly, as rapacious as the annals of Irish crime record—aye, and if His Holiness the Pope says a word or sends a Persico again, is there not a Nulty to give him cheek.

PHILIP DWYER, A.M.

ARCHDEACON BLAKENEY, who has been prostrate with influenza for several weeks, is, on the advice of his doctor, going south for a long rest.

THE Rev. John Wakeford is retiring from Mission work at Easter. For four and a-half years he has been diocesan Missioner in the diocese of Chichester, and was formerly for nearly two years Missioner in the diocese of Exeter. Mr. Wakeford has been advised to take up parish work, and he has the consent of the Bishop to make this change at Easter.

Reviews and Notices.

CONVERSATIONS OF DR. DÖLLINGER, recorded by Louise von Kobell. Translated from the German by Katharine Gould. London : Bentley, 1892. Pp. v. 264.

MISS GOULD has done good work in rendering these interesting records of a great man's sayings accessible to the large number of educated English men and women who are unable to read German. A modern philosopher has expressed his belief that it is a mark of low intellectual capacity or culture to be profoundly interested in personalities. We should be very sorry to share such a belief, and are convinced that it is not true ; and we should have no admiration or affection for the man who considered himself "above" taking great interest in such a man as Döllinger. To not a few of the noblest of his contemporaries he has been one of the most attractive persons in the present century, and his life has been one of the most instructive. Every contribution to a better knowledge of him is of real value, and (except, possibly, to a speculative philosopher) is of real interest. All who had the privilege of knowing him well—and in our own country these are becoming few in number—agree in this, that it was better to listen to him than to read all that he had written, choice as were the too scanty productions of his maturer years. His prodigious memory, his vivacity, his simplicity of manner, his vast acquaintance with the people best worth knowing throughout Europe, and his delightful willingness to impart to others what he knew, all contributed to make intercourse with him one of the highest pleasures that an educated person can enjoy. No record of such conversations can do justice to the reality ; but they are better—a great deal better—than nothing. To those who have never seen him they give some idea of what he was in private life. To those who have known him they serve to recall happy hours spent in his society, and in some cases to bring back to the memory and to the ear the very words that he said and the intonation of his voice. Döllinger's friends owe a debt of gratitude to Madame von Eisenhart, whose maiden name was Von Kobell, for preserving these reminiscences for their enjoyment ; and it is to be hoped that many who cannot count themselves among his friends will increase their knowledge of him by reading her attractive little book, either in the original —which appeared more than a year ago, and was eagerly perused both in Germany and in England—or else in Miss Gould's very readable translation.

We shall give our readers a fair idea of the book by quotations. At the very outset are some which ought to be better known than they are as a safeguard against the danger of taking or giving as Döllinger's opinion that which, during the last thirty or more years of his life, he was convinced was untrue. His early work on Church History was translated into English, and may sometimes be seen in second-hand book catalogues at a high price, as "very scarce." "There is scarcely a line of it," he would say in his later years, "that I could republish as it stands." But let us take the evidence of the present volume :—

"When I read now things which I once wrote, I wonder that I could ever have written them. Well, it is not until one grows old that one learns to judge impartially and justly. . . . . I sometimes feel deep within me pricks of conscience for having, as a teacher of theology, approved of certain things and

represented them in my writings in the best possible light, concealing many a weak point, in my honest zeal for religion and the Church. By so doing I was helping to train those clergy who have now adopted and made themselves responsible for the dogma of infallibility. A man may go far, and yet come to a point where he must pull up, because his conscience refuses to go further. That was my case when the question of this dogma arose" (pp. 11, 16, 17).

Here is a specimen of his utterances respecting the Jesuits, whose energy and devotion to their cause he had in early life greatly admired, but whose principles he at last came to regard with very great abhorrence.

"No one has chastised the Jesuits like Pascal; no one before, and no one since. This famous writer literally scourges them with the lash of his satire. He always adroitly makes use of their own phrases and doctrines. Even his diction is purposely Jesuitical in style. The moral castigation which the Jesuit fathers receive at the hands of Pascal is complete. I greatly admire his fine intellect and sterling character. It is a mistaken policy which induces many writers, in their anxiety to unmask the Jesuits, to snatch so eagerly at falsified documents, which they fondly imagine will serve their purpose, leaving Pascal on one side. . . . . This sort of thing does the Jesuits no harm — the intention is too transparent — but Pascal if you like! He is calculated to harm them" (pp. 134, 135).

Perhaps the book which best marks the transition from Döllinger's early prejudices in favour of everything Roman to his later and critical period is his *Papstfabelu des Mittelalters*. It has recently been republished in Germany, with additional notes by Friedrich. Some twenty years ago it was translated into English in England, and forthwith appropriated in America without the leave of either writer or translator! This is what Döllinger says of the first publication in Germany of these "Mediæval Fables respecting the Popes":—

"Another book brought me into great disfavour with Catholics, and in quarters too where I least expected it. When my 'Fables of the Middle Ages' appeared, the publishers sent me nineteen reviews of it, all of them angry and bitter attacks. Now in these 'Fables of the Middle Ages' I had certainly brought forward nothing new. The story of Pope Joan, for instance, and other such tales, were no longer believed in. It did not require my testimony to upset these; but in this work I pointed out the source from which these fables sprang, and showed how Rome herself had circulated them, and this was the crime they charged me with" (p. 144).

Döllinger lamented that there was so little hero-worship among the boys and youths of the present age. Neither the great men of the past, nor those of our own time, kindle very much enthusiasm. This he knew from hearsay rather than from experience, for since he ceased to lecture in the University, *i.e.*, since 1872, he had not seen much of young men, and still less perhaps of boys.

"The newspapers are, I believe, mainly responsible for the prevailing want of enthusiasm in youthful minds. Look, for instance, at Bismarck, and see how he is bullied and hustled in the process of handling. . . . . Nature cast Bismarck in one mould throughout; he is a masterpiece of patriotism. But the press has bespattered him with mud, wilfully misrepresented and miserably caricatured him, placed all his failings in the light, and thrown into the shade his awe-inspiring capabilities. The newspaper-reading youth see the distorted image, weigh the good and bad in the journalistic balance, and end by cheating themselves of a generous enthusiasm for a worthy object" (pp. 175, 176).

One might fill columns with quotations such as these from these interesting pages; but enough has perhaps been given to induce the reader to buy the book and give himself two or three delightful hours in reading it. Miss Gould does not seem to be aware that Döllinger's *Briefe und Erklärungen* (a most important collection of declarations and letters respecting his rejection of the Vatican Decrees), have been translated in a very handy little volume, published by T. and T. Clark. It forms an excellent companion to Miss Gould's valuable work, which would be made still more valuable if it had an index.

CORRESPONDENCE.

To the Editor of the CHURCH OF ENGLAND PULPIT AND ECCLESIASTICAL REVIEW.

THE KINGDOM OF GOD AND OF HEAVEN.

SIR,—I beg to assure "Student" that I had no thought nor intention of insinuating that he was an Arian, when I asked him whether he made any distinction between the kingdom of God, the kingdom of heaven, and the kingdom of Christ, or rather whether he considered the last of these three to be synonymous with the first, or with the second, or with neither. Even if he had decided that it was not synonymous with the first, I would never have dreamt of inferring from that he was an Arian, or even a semi-Arian, or anything but perfectly orthodox as to the person of Christ, as I have no doubt he is.

I myself, with, I should think, most other students of Holy Scripture, draw a distinction between the throne of the Father on which Christ now sits, and His own throne on which He shall sit when His kingdom comes (see Rev. iii. 21); and I hope I do not, therefore, expose myself to the charge, or even the insinuation of being an Arian.

I find, however, from "Student's" rather too indignant reply to my very simple question, that he identifies the kingdom of Christ with the kingdom of God, and differentiates it from the kingdom of heaven; that he considers the kingdom of Christ as well as the kingdom of God to be the Communion of Saints, while he considers the kingdom of heaven to be the Catholic Church.

Nothing puzzles me so much in all "Student's" distinctions as the way in which he distinguishes, not only between the kingdom of God and the kingdom of heaven, but between the kingdom of heaven in the first, fifth, and sixth parables of Matt. xiii., and the kingdom of heaven, according to the same evangelist, in three other parables or similitudes of the same chapter—I mean the second, third, and fourth—and then, what about the seventh, which is also a similitude of the kingdom of heaven, but which "Student" omits to classify?

"Student" thinks "that there is—nay, must be—a difference in meaning between 'the kingdom of God' and 'the kingdom of heaven.'" If he will allow me to say so, that is his πρῶτον ψεῦδος. I maintain that there is no difference between the two; and, certainly

I see no necessity for its existence, but great necessity for its non-existence. As one necessity which I have already mentioned, St. Mark and St. Luke are inaccurate reporters of our Lord's teaching and were very ineffectually inspired, if the two expressions are not identical in meaning. Moreover, I challenge "Student" to produce a single sentence of any respectable commentator—indeed, I think I may say, of any commentator at all—which makes out any difference between the two expressions. Dean Alford, who, I suppose, is fairly respectable, expressly identifies them. See, *e.g.*, his note on Matt. iii. 2, where he calls "the kingdom of heaven" "an expression peculiar in the New Testament to Matthew—the more usual one"—evidently, for the same thing—"is 'the kingdom of God.'" Further on in the same note he speaks of the one as the "equivalent" of the other.

"Student" says he "has not 'asserted' anything." But did he not assert in his first letter that "the kingdom of heaven is the Catholic Church, the kingdom of God is the Communion of Saints"? If that is not a two-fold assertion (and in my humble opinion a mistaken one), I do not know what an assertion is. What he has not done is to *prove* his assertion or to give any reason whatever for it, strange and novel as it is. I asked him in my last to give a reason for it, but there is no reply.

As perhaps the last word I shall say on this subject, may I ask "Student" if he thinks the difference he makes between the kingdom of heaven and the kingdom of God can be maintained in the case of Matt. xix. 23 and 24? Did our Lord really mean in the one verse "That a rich man shall hardly enter into the Catholic Church," and in the other that "It is easier for a camel to go through the eye of a needle, than for a rich man to enter into the Communion of Saints"? Certainly if He intended any such distinction, Mark and Luke missed it utterly, for they have "the kingdom of God" in both places.

As to my authorities for what "Student" calls "that figment of the brain, an invisible Church," I must leave my other readers to judge whether they are—I will not say "conclusive, but to the point, so far as they go. I certainly never heard of "the reprobate," as the expression is used by Gregory, meaning those who are "cast out of the Church by its act or by their own." Will "Student" kindly adduce any passage from any ecclesiastical, not to say Scripture writer, where it is used in that sense? It is, so far as I am aware, invariably used, as Gregory uses it, as the antithesis to "the elect." I never supposed that all sinners are reprobate. I trust neither "Student" nor myself—sinners though we be (certainly I am)—are reprobate men. My quotations from Clement of Alexandria are so plainly to the point, that "Student must needs insinuate that he is "an equivocal authority." I think most theologians count him a highly respectable authority. Of the two passages I quoted from him, the second, concerning the meaning of which there is no question, even in "Student's" mind, explains the first, where the word "elect" is used just as Gregory used it, and Augustine, and Bede, and Bishop Morton, and Hooker, and Bellarmine, and I imagine all other authorities except "Student." St. Paul distinguishes between Israel and the election in Israel (Rom. xi. 7). "Student" is mistaken about my quotations from Augustine being, either or both of them, from his "City of God," which he discredits. One is from his "De Baptismo," the other from his "De Unitate Ecclesiæ." If my Bishop Morton was his author of the "Book of Sports," he was also the author of the "Catholic Appeal," which is a rather standard work, especially with High Churchmen; and his testimony is all the more valuable inasmuch as he evidently did not sympathise in Church matters with the Puritans, who, to a man, held strongly the distinction between the visible and the invisible Church.

As to what our Church means by the "elect people of God," in our Catechism and elsewhere, I might—and indeed I do—refer "Student" to our 17th Article, and also to one and all of our Reformers who had anything to do with our Prayer Book and Articles. On this subject, perhaps, "Student will allow that the late Canon Mozley, Regius Professor of Divinity in Oxford, could speak with some authority. He says ("A Review of the Baptismal Controversy," p 236): "What was the current and received meaning then of the term 'elect,' at the time of the construction of our Catechism? The answer is that, as understood by the whole Church of that day, and as employed by divines on both sides, Protestant and Roman, it had but one meaning, viz., those who would, out of the whole mass of mankind, be ultimately saved . . . . the elect to eternal life"—Pope Gregory's expression, "those who would finally be saved." That was the sense of Melancthon, Luther, Erasmus, Calvin, Bellarmine, Cranmer, Ridley, Latimer, Nowell, Jewell, and Hooker. · It was the sense of the Thirty-nine Articles and of the Confession of Trent. . . . . Both Calvin and Arminius meant by 'the elect' those who were elected to eternal glory, those who would finally be saved." Perhaps Archbishop Laud will have more weight with "Student." Well, in his reply to Fisher, the Jesuit, who seems to have held with "Student," as well as his brother Jesuit, Bellarmine, on these matters, Laud says: "The Church of the elect is in the Church of them that are called, and the invisible Church in the visible. That the invisible Church of the elect is in the visible is manifest out of St. Augustine: 'The Church itself is that which swims within the Lord's net with the bad fishes.'" And in Dr. John Mayer's "Exposition of the Church Catechism," published by command under Laud's primacy, the following occurs: "If it be further demanded, how can it be said of all baptised that they are members of Christ, I answer that our Church doth not usurp the gift of prophecy, to take upon her to discern which of her children belong to God's unsearchable election, but in the judgment of charity embraceth them all as God's inheritance; and hereby teacheth every one of us so to believe of ourselves by faith, and of others by charity." I must give "Student" one more quotation from Augustine, and that not from his discredited "City of God," but another from "De Baptismo": "But the peace of this unity (of the Church) is among the good alone. . . . . They who within (the Church) are tolerated with sorrow (*cum gemitu*) yet do not belong to that unity of the spirit (*columbæ*), and to that glorious Church not having spot or wrinkle, or any such thing."

February 18th, 1893. W. T. HOBSON.

P.S.—As one of your readers who by no means "object to anything new put forward for their consideration," if only some good reason for it is put forward with it, or sent after it on demand, I answer "Student's" last question, which I had quite overlooked, as follows. Undoubtedly, when our Lord said to Peter, "I will give unto thee the keys of the kingdom of heaven," He meant exactly as if He had said, "the keys of the kingdom of God." And right well St. Peter used the keys, opening the kingdom of God

or of heaven to the Jews on the day of Pentecost, and to the Gentiles, as represented by Cornelius and his household, shortly after. Why, even on "Student's" own assumption, that "the kingdom of God" means "the Communion or Fellowship (κοινωνία) of Saints," as distinct from "the Catholic Church," it would be true that Peter, using his keys, admitted men to the kingdom of God. Does "Student" really think—"can it be imagined"?—that he admitted men to "the Catholic Church," and not to "the Communion of Saints," *i.e.*, according to "Student," to the kingdom of heaven," and not to "the kingdom of God"?

W. T. H.

WHAT DID SOCRATES WRITE?

SIR,—Dr. Panter in the PULPIT of the 18th (p. 73, col. 1), says he has seen an ape chattering over *the open pages of Socrates*. It has till lately been believed that Socrates wrote nothing, but I suppose a work of his has been unearthed among the other MSS. in the Fayoum. Will Dr. Panter kindly give your readers information about this.

JOSEPH JOHN MURPHY.

Belfast, February 20th, 1893.

MR. REID'S SERMON.

SIR,—I felt some slight indignation at observing, in a sermon in the PULPIT of to-day, the best hymn, among the various good hymns that Dr. Doddridge wrote, attributed to another—Dr. Bonar.

There is another observation that I take this opportunity to make upon the sermon generally. The title "In Memoriam" is the key to the following. The institution of the Christian Passover is in memory of the Great Sacrifice, as the Israelitish Passover was in anticipation of it. But, in advance of the Prototype, which did not, so far as is revealed to us, minister spiritual food to the partakers, the Antitype does so minister it; and we are given very unmistakably to understand, by the sixth chapter of St. John's Gospel, that the purpose of the institution is the ministration of that spiritual food. In the sermon, this leading consideration of the whole matter is dismissed with a few words.

Mr. Reid goes on after this to explain that the Holy Eucharist is not a sacrifice, and that there is no such officer as a Christian priest, our Lord being the great High Priest. Be it observed on this, that if the first Passover was a sacrifice, the second is *prima facie* a sacrifice, too, and it is so called in the first commemoration prayer of our service. Not a sacrifice to put away sin, for the Israelitish Passover was not either; it is impossible that the blood of bulls and goats should put away sin, but it was a sacrifice nevertheless. If not such, what does feasting upon the elements, after the manner of all animal sacrifices, mean? Again, about the Priesthood, all persons baptised into Christ become by adoption members of Him, and all persons confirmed by laying on of hands are consecrated priests to offer spiritual sacrifices (1 Peter ii. 5). If the lay members of Christ's Body are priests, at least as much must they, whose office it is to conduct for the congregation the offering of the most evident and most precious of all sacrifices, be also priests.

Mr. Reid's exposition of the error or falsehood of transubstantiation is utterly unsatisfactory. He appears to me to believe the exploded notion of substance in a kind of way, and yet not exactly to know what it is; for he says that qualities can have no existence apart from the bodies to which they belong. Whereas the very essence of the notion of substance is that it has an existence independent of accidents, and the realistic philosophy asserts the absolute existence of abstractions of qualities, the former of which notions Berkeley destroyed, I had hoped for ever. Mr. Reid appears further to think that the idea of a grace being contained in the Holy Eucharist itself depends on the transubstantiation theory, which it does not. St. Paul very plainly tells us that the grace being received depends on the discernment of the Lord's body, while its non-discernment entails damnation or judgment.

This letter is growing too long.

EDMUND LAWRENCE.

February 18th, 1893.

DISESTABLISHMENT IN WALES.

SIR,—Now that war has been distinctly declared by the Government against the Church in Wales, it may be of service to call public attention to the need of diffusing sound and reliable information as to the Church in the Principality

This must be my excuse for mentioning the valuable leaflets published two or three years ago on Church and State questions in Wales, and compiled by the well-known author of the "Englishman's Brief" and Mr. Stanley Leighton, M.P.

The series consists of eight papers, dealing with tithes, etc.; and two, written by Mr. Leighton, are of especial value, entitled "Nonconformity, How Established by Law," and "Nonconformity, How Aided by the State."

These can be had in Welsh or English on application at the "Church and Queen" Office, 116, Strand.

I may add that the leaflets have been approved by the Welsh Bishops.

L. NEVILLE.

Cambridge, February 14, 1893.

PREFERMENTS AND APPOINTMENTS.

Bass, Rev. Thomas J., Curate of St. Paul's, Southport; Association Secretary of the Church Pastoral Aid Society in the West Midland district.

Brown. Rev. Ernest William, M.A., Rector of Montgomery.

Carroll, Rev. William A., B.A.; Priest-in-Charge of the Christ Church, Oxford, Mission, Poplar (St. Frideswide's).

Champion, Rev. Arthur; Rector of Horne, Surrey.

Cheadle, Rev. J. H., M.A., Minor Canon of Westminster Abbey; Theological Tutor in King's College, London.

Clarke, Rev. F. A., M.A., Vice-Principal of Wells Theological College; Rector of Duntesbourne Rouse, Gloucesterehire.

Copinger, Rev. Herbert E., Curate of All Souls, Clapton; Curate-in-Charge of the Church of the Holy Spirit, Abbeyhill, Edinburgh.

Coulthard, Rev. Ernest Newton, M.A., Metropolitan Secretary of the Church Pastoral Aid Society; Vicar of St. James's, Bermondsey.

Ellam, Rev. Arthur, M.A.; Assistant Perpetual Curate in Beverley Minster.

Elliott, Rev. George; Chaplain of St. Saviour's Union Infirmary.

Ferris, Rev. A. H., M.A., Vicar of Charlestown, and Rural Dean; Surrogate for the Diocese of Truro.

Forrester, Rev. George, formerly Vicar of St. Paul's, Clapham; Vicar of Collumpton, South Devon.

Fuller, Rev. M. J., B.A.; Vicar of St. Mark's, Marylebone-road.
Hodgson, Rev. J. L., B.A., Priest-Vicar of the Cathedral of St. George and St. Michael, and Assistant-Master of the Cathedral School, Grahamstown; Precentor of the Cathedral, and Head Master of the Cathedral School.
Hooper, Rev. Alfred James, M.A., Curate of St. Luke's, Kingston-on-Thames; Vicar of St. Bartholomew's, Camberwell.
Howell, Rev. Jonathan, M.A., Vicar of All Saints, Derby; Surrogate for the Diocese of Southwell.
Jenkins, Rev. William, Rector of Llanfair-juxta-Harlech, Merionethshire; Rector of Llangristiolus-with-Cerrig Ceinwen, Anglesey.
Jervis, Rev. John; Vicar of Oakington, Cambridge.
Jones, Rev. Robert, M.A., Curate of Llandegfan, Anglesey; Rector of Llanfair-juxta-Harlech, Merionethshire.
Nelson, Rev. Horatio William, Harbour Chaplain at Bombay; Chaplain on the Indian Ecclesiastical Establishment.
Parsons, Rev. C. J., M.A; Vicar of Stockleigh English, Devonshire.
Phillips, Rev. Thompson, M.A., Vicar of St. George's, Barrow; Archdeacon of Furness.
Pott, Rev. Alfred Percivall, M.A.; Rector of Newington, Oxon.
Powell, Rev. Frederick Glyn Montagu, Chaplain to the Duke of Buccleuch at St. Mary's Chapel, Dalkeith; Vicar of St. Luke's, Southampton.
Pryke, Rev. William E., Head Master of the Royal Grammar-School, Lancaster; Chaplain to the High Sheriff of Lancashire (Sir Thomas Storey).
Roberts, Rev. W. M., M.A.; Rector of Luddesdown, Kent.
Scott, Rev. E. A. S., M.A., Curate of St. Bede's, Hartington-road, Liverpool; Clerical Deputation Secretary in the North-Eastern District of the Church of England Central Society for Providing Homes for Waifs and Strays.
Sewell, Rev. Henry, M.A.; Licensed Preacher in the Diocese of Manchester.
Sheilds, Rev. John Samuel Sandys, D.D., Secretary of the Irish Church Missions; Vicar of St. Matthew's, West Kensington.
Sing, Rev. Canon George Herbert, M.A., Vicar of St. John's, Derby; Surrogate for the Diocese of Southwell.
Smith, Rev. Frederick Robert, M.A.; Vicar of Flixton, Suffolk.
Smith, Rev. William, M.A.; Rector of Hartshorne, Derbyshire.
Sprigg, Rev. Herbert Guildford, Six-Preacher of Canterbury Cathedral; Rector of Emsworth, near Portsmouth.
Symonds, Rev. Septimus, B.A., Curate of Christ Church, Eastbourne; Rector of Coton, near Cambridge.
Thomas, Rev. Francis Edward, M.A.; Rector of Chorlton-cum-Hardy, Manchester.
Tomlinson, Rev. Arthur Roger, M.A., Rector of Lamorran; Rector of St. Michael's, Penkevil, Cornwall.
Trethewy, Rev. Henry, M.A., Curate of St. John-the-Baptist's, Leamington; Vicar of Hatton, Warwickshire.
Washer, Rev. Rupert Edgar; Vicar of Walton, Suffolk, on his own petition.
White, Rev. G. Cecil, Rector of Nursling, Southampton; Commissary for the Bishop of Rangoon.
Wells, Rev. J. F., M.A., Rector of St. Peter's, March.

CLERICAL OBITUARY.

Dalton, Rev. Charles Browne, M.A., Senior Prebendary of St. Paul's Cathedral, for twenty-four years Vicar of Highgate, and some time Rector of Lambeth, at the Precincts, Rochester, on the 20th inst., in his eighty-third year.
Deane, Rev. Richard Wallace, formerly Vicar of Turville, at 6, Victoria-park, Dover, on the 14th inst., aged 72.
How, Rev. George A. M., Prebendary of St. Paul's, Rural Dean of Stepney, and Vicar of Bromley, at the Vicarage, Bromley, Middlesex, on the 18th inst., aged 52.
Jackson, Rev. Edward Bullock, Incumbent of Lethbridge, at Orillia, Canada West, on the 8th inst.
Moore, Rev. Edward, for nearly fifty years Rector of Boughton Malherbe, at Stone Dean, on the 14th inst., aged 73.
Theodosius, Rev. J. H., at 10, Castle-villas, Stafford, on the 8th inst.
Wood, Rev. Lewis Weyman, twenty-one years vicar of the parish, at Dunton Bassett, on the 16th inst., aged 65.
Wright, Rev. John, M.A., late Rector of Falmouth, at Sidcup, on the 13th inst., within five weeks of completing his 100th year.

FIRST REMOVE THE CAUSE.

MEN frequently worry and trouble themselves a great deal in trying to cure the symptoms of vital weakness nervous exhaustion, and kindred ailments, instead of endeavouring to first remove the cause. This can be done by Mr. Harness' Electropathic Treatment without the aid of drugs. It is useless to tell sufferers to employ their minds and bodies in useful work and to forget their disorders, so long as the cause of their troubles is not removed. How can it be expected that when they are fatigued by the least exertion they can occupy themselves by studying, walking, or other exercise? Even in conversation they frequently lose the thread of it and repeatedly find their memory failing them. What can they do? Physic will not cure them—perhaps the leading physicians have fallen to afford them any relief, and they have consequently become hopeless. It is to such as these that Mr. Harness' new combined Electropathic Belt and Suspensory is so strongly recommended, as, by its gentle but continuous action, invigorating electric currents are imperceptibly generated and conveyed direct from the spinal cord to the affected parts. It is this scientifically constructed and convenient appliance which silently but surely acts upon the vital organs, and removes the cause of the patient's disease, effecting a wonderful change in his health, character, and conduct, and speedily enabling him to return to his natural tastes and habits, and enjoy once more the full vigour of youth, with all its accompanying pleasures.

We may add that this perfect Electro-medical appliance is exceedingly comfortable to wear, gives wonderful support and vitality to all the internal organs of the body, prevents chills, imparts new life and vigour to the debilitated constitution, stimulates the organic action, promotes the circulation, assists digestion, and promptly renews that vital energy, the loss of which is the first symptom of decay. Its healing properties are multifarious. It stimulates the functions of various organs, increases their secretions, gives tone to muscle and nerves, relaxes morbid contractions, improves nutrition, and effectually renews exhausted nerve force. Acting directly on the system, it sustains and assists its various functions, and thus promotes the health and vigour of the entire frame. Besides these benefits, the mind is maintained in a buoyant, cheerful state, and every faculty is stimulated to the highest condition of intellectual strength.

Gentlemen who read the above announcement have only to visit London and call at the Electropathic and Zander Institute (52, Oxford Street, W.) to be convinced of the marvellous curative powers of Electricity and Mr. Harness' perfect methods of imperceptibly applying the current. The medical officers of the establishment are in daily attendance, and may by consulted free of charge either personally or by letter.

The Church of England Pulpit.

THE TABERNACLE OF GOD WITH MEN.

By the Right Rev. the LORD BISHOP OF WAKEFIELD, D.D.

Sermon Preached before the University of Cambridge, on Septuagesima Sunday, January 29th, 1893.

"Behold, the tabernacle of God is with men."—Rev. xxi. 3.

OUR first lesson this morning begins with the words, "In the beginning God created the heaven and the earth"; our second lesson with the words, "I saw a new heaven and a new earth." I suppose that once almost all readers of the Bible imagined, or tried to imagine, a stupendous display of Divine power, acting from without upon the crude matter of the universe, and bringing into shape and order the world we live in, even as some artificer of surpassing skill might fashion wondrous products from the elementary material of his special industry. By degrees, and in these later days, we have been taught by that book, the language of which was so long unknown to, and unread by, man—the book of nature—to put aside our childish notion of numberless successive acts of arbitrary and instantaneous creative energy, and to recognise, dimly enough at first, possibilities of long eras of slow preparation and gradual change. But still it seemed natural to think of these growths and changes and progressive stages of creation as directed from without by a sort of sustained and continuous operation of supernatural and almighty power, in place of sudden and intermittent acts of an irresistible and omnipotent will. And then the watchers and the thinkers became bolder, and began to talk of an evolution which should comprehend all things, drawing into its insatiate embrace all phenomena, moral and intellectual, no less than physical, and allowing no breaks, such as some of the earlier teachers allowed, in the advent of the principle of life, or of consciousness, or of intellect. I suppose that more and more science is endowing evolution with a unity and a continuity and a universality, which seem to many full of tremendous issues. Perhaps no one as yet pretends that the new philosophy of life can account for the first source and origin of things, but many accept it as at any rate a proximate account of all phenomena of which we can take cognizance, and we tremble lest, if it prove true, it shut out all ideas of creation except perhaps of some primal act or force or movement at an almost infinitely remote period in the past. And yet, side by side with this growing tendency of modern thought, which seems to the sceptic to account for most things without the necessity for God, and which comes to the believer at times like a nightmare of undefined terror, there is surely growing also a deeper conception of the presence of God in His creation—an immanence of Divine power—interpenetrating and unifying the whole. We have always taught our little children that God is everywhere. Perhaps we have not sounded all the depths of that simple teaching. It may be that God means us to see in the wonderful unity and stedfast onward movement of the things around us a grand expression of His being, the world of nature ever taking form by His inherent life and will, and becoming the mouthpiece of His enacting wisdom. "The tabernacle of God" is perchance with us and about us in a profounder sense than we have imagined. God is everywhere, and His life is the life of all things; but it sometimes almost seems as if we set God over against His works instead of beholding Him in His works. May we not be invited to see in the wondrous, and ever increasingly wondrous, revelation of the laws and forces of nature a revelation of the methods of God's acting? And is it not true that the tranquil operation of law, in its resistless and uniform consistency is a truer exhibition of the strength of God than could ever be some startling miraculous breach of the continuity of law, or the most terrific catastrophe that the imagination of man can conceive? "The mills of God grind slowly, yet they grind exceeding small," as Longfellow sings in his translation of a German poem. Yes, they grind slowly, and surely, and incessantly; but it is a great thing to know that they are the mills *of God*, and not the mills of fate. This is no Pantheism that I speak of; for Pantheism is the identity of God with Nature, and not the immanence of God in Nature. Pantheism, no doubt, expresses the truth of God's presence in all things; but it has no place for God beyond and above Nature. It is a plain limitation of the Infinite. We would see in all Nature a handwriting of God's wisdom; we would hear in all Nature a voice of God's love; we would recognise in all Nature an intimate presence and energy of God.

I have spoken of Nature quite in a popular sense, as signifying the world of phenomena in which we find ourselves. But all I have said receives new force and fulness when we turn to man and regard his complex and marvellous development. If the forces that are acting all around us, and the great laws which govern or record their action are manifestations of God, much more must the moral and intellectual equipment of man be a manifestation of God. That God made man in His own image is proclaimed in His Word, nor am I able to conceive of a God, or to conceive that

there could be a God, whose moral and intellectual nature should be different from man's. We conceive of God, and can only conceive of God, as being perfectly that which we are imperfectly. It is absurd to imagine a moral being whose primary ideas of morality are different from our own, or an intelligent being whose primary laws of thought are different from our own. So that man's nature, with all its failures and faults, all its depravity and discord, does still in a very true sense bear the image of God, and reveal the presence and purpose of God. "In Him we live, and move, and have our being." God has surely been ever working in the growth and training and education of man. And that there is an upward and onward tendency and growth in man it would be terrible to doubt. No doubt it is a progress through contest and struggle, and often defeat. No doubt the absolute necessity for freedom of will in a moral being makes the upward movement difficult to gauge at any given moment. If you go down to the seashore aud watch the waves, you cannot tell for a while whether the tide is rising or falling. Many a wave may fall short of the point reached by a preceding wave, and yet the tide may be rising all the while, and, if you go away for an hour and return, you will see how the mighty volume has moved onward up the shore. Even of individual men (though I have been speaking of the race), it is lawful to hold the beautiful hopeful creed of our great poet of hope, who beholds them—

> "All with a touch of nobleness, despite
> Their error, upward tending all, though weak;
> Like plants in mines, which never saw the sun,
> But dream of him, and guess where he may be,
> And do their best to climb and get to him." *

I have been trying to point to a movement of modern thought which seems to me to hold in it some compensating value for such loss of definiteness in the conception of creating energy as may seem to be introduced by the scientific teachings of the day. "I have felt," says Wordsworth—

> "A presence which disturbs me with the joy
> of elevated thoughts; a sense sublime
> Of something far more deeply interfused,
> Whose dwelling is the light of setting suns,
> And the round ocean, and the living air,
> And in the blue sky, and in the mind of man:
> A motion and a spirit that impels
> All thinking things, all objects of all thought,
> And rolls through all things."†

What is this "presence" which so filled the poet's soul with such glad and exalted emotion? I would answer reverently, *the presence of God.*

But surely there is yet another thought which cannot be far away from the mind of the Christian man who meditates on these high themes. We have spoken of the immanence of God in all Creation, and of His manifestations of Himself in the grandeur of His laws, the unity of His designs, the progress of His onward movement. And this in all the, to us, so diverse spheres of His acting. And there must assuredly be some goal to which this onward movement is tending, some ideal which in this progress is being worked towards. It cannot be—if only we believe in a Divine intelligence interpenetrating and informing the whole—it cannot be that the advance is capricious, accidental, governed by no aim and purpose. If there is, as Tennyson says, "One God—one law—one element," there must also be the "one far-off divine Event, to which the whole creation moves." But we have been shown an ideal. In the fulness of time, when the work of preparation had reached its proper stage, amid the tangles and confusions of a helpless, but yearning and struggling humanity, there emerged the pattern Man, the Man as God designed him, the Man who should be to mankind the revelation of God. "For God, who commanded the light to shine out of darkness, hath shined in our hearts, to give the light of the knowledge of the glory of God in the face of Jesus Christ." And He is "the brightness of God's glory and the express image of His person." Shall we doubt that all previous progress and growth was pointing onwards and leading upwards to this supreme Ideal? Shall we doubt that all accesses of gifts and faculties, all emergences from lower to higher types, all steps and stages in the mystic unfolding of the ages, had their end and consummation in Him? May it not be that the Incarnation is the great key to the secret of Evolution? It is true that as yet this ideal has been presented to us only in the one Divine Man, who was Son of God in the mystery of His eternal being, and Son of Man in His assumption of perfect humanity. But the progress and the growth is thereby mightily fostered and advanced. For, as God in the ages past was working towards His great ideal, so in revealing that ideal to us in all our unworthiness and imperfection, He would engage us as fellow-workers in the same grand work, bidding us individually, as our aim and end, to "grow up into Him in all things which is the Head, even Christ, till we come to a perfect man, to the measure of the stature of the fulness of Christ."

"In the beginning God created the heaven and the earth." There is the first foundation of the glorious structure, the very rudiments out of which has sprung all this complex life and being. Whatever the true interpretation of the wonderful story of Creation which we have read once more to-day —perchance a record of splendid summarized visions of creation—still there that first verse stands in all the majestic grandeur of its simple utterance. There may be myriads of ages, for all we know, between the first and second verses of the Bible. But there is the origin of all things. And then in the latter days another seer writes, "I beheld a new heaven and a new earth." And there is the consummation of all things—that to which all

* Paracelsus. † Tintern Abbey.

things are being divinely guided—not another end and another ideal apart from Christ, for the new heaven and the new earth are full of Christ, the sphere and condition of His eternal life and being. We look back on the past, and read and ponder the story with reverent wonder and amazement. We look forward to the future with eager hope and longing. But we are here, spending our few brief days in this strange clouded life, in these dim, uncertain lights and shadows, half conscious of a wondrous history, half conscious of a splendid destiny, sometimes trembling, perhaps, like children in the dark, and then again smitten with some flash of light revealing hidden glories; and we are a strange mystery to ourselves. We are ever asking—asking in these days with eager and almost desperate persistency—whence came we, and whither go we? And if human research and human philosophy are allowed to tell us something in answer to the first question, they have nothing to tell us in answer to the second. So far as mere human reason can discern, there is nothing to be seen in the dim future but what the German poet-philosopher beheld, when he sang—

> "Solemn before us, veiled, the dark portal,
> Goal of all mortal.
> Stars silent shine o'er us,
> Graves under us silent."

But God has taught us by His Spirit that not in vain are all these strange mysterious yearnings of man's heart, not in vain this eager stretching forth of the hands into the dim future, not in vain this presage and prophecy, in the inmost depths of our nature, of greater things to be. Through the bars of the solemn portal come gleams of the golden light within; the very stars sing together and declare the glory of God; from the very graves comes a voice re-echoing, "I know that my Redeemer liveth." Yes, in some mystic sense, which perhaps it is not given us yet to understand, but which helps us at least to climb some upward steps in the progress of our manhood, as we recognise the vast unscaled heights which lie above us and beyond, "we look for new heaven and a new earth wherein dwelleth righteousness."

Two great practical thoughts seem to shape themselves before the mind that muses on these things. The first is the strength and blessedness that come from the realisation of the presence of God, and the second the light and hope that spring from the realisation of the progress of man. To realise the presence of God is the one supreme function of Faith. For Faith is the power that realises the unseen, the eye of the soul which looks "not at the things which are seen, which are temporal, but at the things which are not seen, which are eternal." I suppose it is with most of us the hardest struggle of our lives, if we are trying at all to live a higher life than the life of this world, to maintain some consciousness—even a poor dim intermittent consciousness—of the presence of another world, and of all that this implies. We are such slaves to sense, so dominated and tyrannised over by the outward, that we are always in peril of a practical materialism. The things of sense—the visible, the tangible, the audible—these seem to lie so close around us, that they, as it were, push back and hide from us the presence which only Faith discerns. Whether there are many intellectually convinced materialists or not, it is perfectly certain that there are multitudes everywhere of these practical materialists. Oh, to tear in twain, if but for a moment, this thick gaudy-painted curtain which the world hangs so close before our eyes, and to set ourselves in the realised presence of the everlasting verities of the world unseen! Nay, that is a false figure. We speak as if God were beyond the veil. Beyond! Why, the very thought that has been occupying us but now is the thought of God's immanence in all things. Beyond! Why, it needed no Divine revelation to teach man that "in Him we live, and move, and have our being." He must be closer to us than anything of sense and of matter can be. Not "beyond the veil," not "in the other world," not in "the light which no man can approach unto," not in strange regions of an unknown light, but here, everywhere, in all things, in nature, in man. That is where we must realise God. Blessed are they who live by Faith. It is one of the most striking things in the life of the late Archbishop Tait that from his early youth he seems never to have been without this consciousness of God's presence. The power of Faith was with him indeed a blessed gift of God. But let us note one thing. If Faith, in its essence, as a gift, a faculty, a power, is the realisation of the unseen, it is plain that its practical issue and bearing on the life and on the man will vary with the clearness and distinctness with which the great objects of Faith are realised. Thus Faith in the existence of an unseen world, such as the noble-minded philosophers of the heathen world achieved, was a splendid possession, lifting its possessor above the dreadful blank materialism of the man whose horizon was narrowed to the petty circle of his earthly life. Faith in a personal God, such as was granted to God's chosen people of old, a God who ruled in justice, a God who heard prayer, a God who spake by the prophets, this was a nobler creed, and a more potent instrument of righteousness. Faith in a Divine Father, in a God, not of justice only but of love,—faith in one yearning (as in our poor English language we say, speaking as men) yearning for His children's welfare, asking for their love, proclaiming Himself as a God of mercy—such faith as was gradually unfolded and developed in the saints and seers of old, this was a yet more holy and blessed thing. Yes, but strongest and noblest and best and most blessed of all is the faith which can centre itself in God incarnate, which can realise the Divine Man, which can trace

at least the grand outlines of the perfect ideal, which can contemplate a crucified, a loving, an omnipresent Saviour. "This is the victory that overcometh the world, even our faith. For who is he that overcometh the world but he that believeth that Jesus is the Son of God?" If God is a presence immanent in all His works, so is the Lord Jesus Christ, for He is God, inseparably one with the Father, Creator, and Upholder of all things.

And then there is the thought of progress to inspire hope and courage. There are terrible evils, despairing perplexities, bitter disappointments, in the world. I know not how we could bear these things without hope of progress. I do not mean bear them as evils without a remedy, sitting still and trusting that somehow a better state of things would some day arise, but bear them while combating the wrongs, while striving to solve the desperate problems, while struggling in countless ways (as, thank God, men are struggling) to better the world around them. And it is bettered. Bad enough still no doubt, but bettered. We hear hoarse denunciations of the bitter wrongs of society, and might almost fancy while we listen that our land was never so miserable, never so down-trodden, never so hopelessly misgoverned, as at this day. But it is not so. It is simply absurd to pretend such things. There has been, in the present generation even, progress in a multitude of lines, and not least in that which is most vehemently denied—in the material prosperity of our workers. It is going on. It will go on. But it needs a stern love of truth and justice, a determined unselfishness, a patient study of history and of facts, to carry on this great work of growth and progress for our people. Meanwhile it would seem that all must really rest in the growth and progress of the individual. The only possible way to make the world better is to make the men and women of the world better. There can be no progress of the whole while the parts stand still or deteriorate. And this of all—of the leaders and of the led, of of the workers with head and of the workers with hand. The absolute and essential condition of all true progress is the growth in the individual of truth, and honesty, and love, and unselfishness, and industry. But this means the growth of Christianity. When men are truly Christian, we may try social experiments without danger.

I have said that God has shown us our ideal. Yes, there it stands, the awful, the stupendous height at which we are bidden to aim. It is like some glorious Alpine crest of glittering snow, far away in the blue sky. We tremble as we look up. It is so far above us. Yes! but God would have us aim high. I know we shall not reach that far-off airy summit here. But there are many crests, and ridges, and lower heights between. We will at least set ourselves to scale some nearer height; and then onward yet, our watchword still "Excelsior!" some triumphs even now," and perchance "other heights in other worlds, God willing," as Browning sings. And "the tabernacle of God is with men." He is with us, above us, below us, around us, within us. How can we fail while we realise this? "He is on my right hand, I shall not fall." As I strain upward, with tottering steps and feeble strength, I am not afraid, for He leads, He supports, He comforts me. If I fall, if I sink down in my weakness, I will rise up again and press on, for He will never leave me nor forsake me. My Father is with me. My Saviour is with me. The blessed Spirit of my God is my strength. Therefore will we go forward and faint not. We are very weak and very ignorant, but God's strength is made perfect in weakness, and we hope one day to know even as we are known. And faint, halting, inconstant though our progress be, yet we will keep our faces forward, and by God's grace "go from strength to strength, until unto the God of gods appeareth every one of us in Zion."

THE Duke of Fife has sent £25 to the funds of the social scheme of the Church Army.

THE Rev. Morris Fuller, B.D., vicar of Bishop's Tawton, who, as stated in our list of preferments last week, has just been instituted to the vicarage of St. Mark's, Marylebone-road, has been for many years connected with the diocese of Exeter. He was formerly rector of Lydford-cum-Princetown, during which time he built two Mission chapels on Dartmoor, erected the handsome new rectory at Lydford, and partially restored Princetown and Lydford churches. Mr. Fuller is a well-known contributor to ecclesiastical literature.

THE scheme for a memorial to the late Professor Hort of Cambridge was taken up very warmly at the meeting last Wednesday week, at Trinity Lodge. Of many good speeches the most interesting were those of the Bishop of Peterborough and the Master of Emmanuel. Dr. Creighton said that he regarded the late Lady Margaret Professor as the most conspicuous example of all the best qualities which academic life developed. In his experience of the two Universities he knew no one who was so entirely imbued with the qualities which a University ought to be proud of and engender in its sons. He dwelt especially on Professor Hort's academic patriotism, the time he devoted to the business of the University as well as the fastidious care he bestowed on doing that business well. He was to those who saw him a constant stimulus; he was perpetually, by the fact of his mere existence among them, raising up a higher standard in the pursuit of knowledge and of business integrity and straightforwardness of character. Dr. Phear's speech had a special interest, as it was he who recognised the value of Professor Hort's work, and had him recalled to academic life from the little Trinity living in Hertfordshire which he had held for some time. Professor Hort's election to a Fellowship at Emmanuel gave him the opportunity for pursuing those critical studies with which his name is now associated. In regard to their value as models for textual criticism of all kinds Professor Jebb spoke in most appreciative terms.

NOTICES.

All communications respecting the Literary portion of the paper should be addressed to the Editor.

Business communications of every kind should be addressed to Mr. S. GIBBON, at the CHURCH OF ENGLAND PULPIT Office, 160, Fleet Street, London, E.C., to whom cheques and Post-office orders for subscriptions (in advance), three months, 2s., six months, 3s. 6d., twelve months, 6s. 6d., are to be made payable.

The Cases for binding Vol. XXXIV. are now ready.

FOR HEALTH AND IMMORTALITY.

The Ecclesiastical Review.

SATURDAY, MARCH 4, 1893.

THE LINCOLN JUDGMENT.

WE have been requested to publish the following declaration. It is stated that the number of signatures has been purposely limited to fifty, consisting of clergy holding responsible positions in various parts of the country. Beyond this there has been no attempt to canvass for signatures :—

We, the undersigned clergy, after careful deliberation, desire to place on record some convictions and apprehensions which we entertain respecting the "Lincoln" judgment and its effect on the future of the Church of England, for the following reasons :—

(*a*) That our silence may not be misunderstood ; or taken, either now or in years to come, to imply approval of the decision.

(*b*) That we may avow our sympathy with the large number of our lay brethren who view the recent judgment with distress.

(*c*) That our true attitude may be made clear before the Church ; and that we may support our brethren, clerical and lay, who in their respective neighbourhoods find themselves isolated in the maintenance of true Church of England doctrine.

(*d*) That we may discourage all thoughts of secession.

In so doing we wish to declare :—

1. That we feel the responsibility at such a crisis of saying only words that will make for "truth and peace."

2. That as loyal Churchmen we bow to the decisions of the Supreme Court.

3. That we hold the rights and ceremonies of divine worship to be, in the words of the Prayer-book, "things in their own nature indifferent and alterable, and so acknowledged."

4. That we have no desire to narrow the boundaries of the Church of England, and should deplore the exclusion of any of the historic schools of thought which have always existed within her pale. In this statement we cannot include the party of modern growth whose avowed purpose is to undo the work of the Reformation.

5. That we do not contend for the doctrines of a party, but for principles which are enshrined in the formularies of the Church of England, as they are in the teaching of the Apostolic age. Our concern is that they shall not be dislodged from that position, nor obscured by inconsistent ceremonial practices.

The following are some of the convictions and apprehensions which we entertain :—

1. We believe that the legalised toleration of a variety of ritual in the administration of the Holy Communion will prove a serious evil. The intention of the Reformers was uniformity in worship and ritual. With a deep conviction of the evils which had arisen from a diversity of "use" in the service of the Church, they resolved that "now, from henceforth all the whole realm shall have but one use (*vide* Preface to the Prayer-book). The same principle held in the matter of ritual, and for three centuries, amid considerable variety of thought and opinion, there has been a general uniformity of ritual, both in the celebration of divine worship and in the administration of the sacraments. Proceeding upon an opposite principle, the Lincoln judgment allows a diversity of ritual, and such a diversity as will, in effect, stamp the Lord's Supper as the great disuniting ordinance among English Churchmen.

2. We believe that the "sense of unreality," to quote the words of the *Times*, "in the effort to treat as neutral or colourless acts which we all know to be, in the view of a party in the Church, technical symbols and unequivocal doctrinal signs," will be perplexing to many minds, and prejudicial in its effect upon the moral tone of our people.

3. We fear that there is no finality in the present decision, and that on similar principles other practices, discarded at the Reformation and hitherto deemed illegal, may in like manner be legalised.

We can discern no signs that ritual practices will be restrained within the limits of the judgment.

4. One of our gravest fears is as to the effect of the recent decision on many of the earnest and hitherto loyal members of the Church, and consequently on the Church of England herself. The judgment practically admits the grievance of those who have these practices inflicted upon them in their parish churches ; but it offers no remedy. The result must be that where there is not secession, or a lapse into indifference, many of the godly laity who feel the judgment a severe strain upon their allegiance will lose their zeal for the Church, and be paralysed in their efforts to defend her.

5. On the other hand, although we search in vain the pages of the judgment for any bold vindication of the true position of the Reformed Church of England, and of the non-sacerdotal character of her ministry, there are undoubtedly points in it which claim our grateful recognition.

But whilst the above-mentioned grave anxieties possess our minds, we lose neither heart nor hope, and we would earnestly and affectionately urge any persons who are tempted to waver in their allegiance to stand by the Church of England in loyalty, faith, and courage ; to put forth renewed and self-denying efforts to make her true principles known and felt ; carefully and systematically to teach (especially the young) those vital, Apostolic doctrines which constitute the distinguishing glory both of the English Church and English Prayer-book ; remembering always that our trust and strength is in Him Who in days which are past has vindicated His Truth in the time of peril, and will assuredly do so again.

W. R. FREMANTLE, Dean of Ripon.
W. LEFROY, Dean of Norwich.
E. H. PERowne, Master of Corpus Christi College, Cambridge.
F. W. FARRAR, Archdeacon of Westminster and Chaplain to the Speaker.
J. E. BLAKENEY, Archdeacon and Vicar of Sheffield.
JOHN RICHARDSON, Archdeacon of Southwark.
BENJ. S. CLARKE, Archdeacon of Liverpool ; Vicar of Christ Church, Southport.
J. HUGHES-GAMES, Archdeacon of Man ; Rector of Andreas, Isle of Man.
T. D. BERNARD, Canon-Residentiary of Wells.
W. W. GIBBON, Canon-Residentiary of Ripon.

H. B. TRISTRAM, Canon-Residentiary of Durham.
HANDLEY C. G. MOULE, Principal of Ridley Hall, Cambridge.
F. J. CHAVASSE, Principal of Wycliffe Hall, Oxford.
WALTER ABBOTT, Vicar of Paddington.
WILLIAM A. BATHURST, Vicar of Holy Trinity, Eastbourne.
JOHN BARTON, Vicar of Holy Trinity, Cambridge.
CHARLES D. BELL, Rector of Cheltenham; Hon. Canon of Carlisle.
R. E. BROOKE, Rector of Bath; Canon of York.
GORDON CALTHROP, Vicar of St. Augustine's, Highbury; Prebendary of St. Paul's.
T. T. N. CAUSTON, Vicar of St. Matthew's, Croydon.
W. HAY CHAPMAN, Rector of All Souls', Langham-place.
A. M. W. CHRISTOPHER, Rector of St. Aldate's; Hon. Canon of Christ Church, Oxford.
J. W. CONSTERDINE, Vicar of St. Philip's, Chorley, Cheshire.
H. W. DEARDEN, Vicar of Southborough, Tunbridge-wells.
A. R. FAUSSET, Rector of St. Cuthbert's, York, and Canon of York.
H. E FOX, Vicar of St. Nicholas, Durham.
R. W. FAWKES, Vicar of High Harrowgate.
R. B. GIRDLESTONE, late Principal of Wycliffe Hall, Oxford; Hon. Canon of Christ Church.
T. HOWARD GILL, Vicar of Tonbridge, Kent.
GILBERT KARNEY, Vicar of St. John's, Paddington.
G. F. HEAD, Vicar of Christ Church, Hampstead.
ROBERT C. JENKINS, Rector of Lyminge; Hon. Canon of Canterbury.
B. LAMB, Vicar of St. George's, Leeds.
J. T. LANG, Fellow and Tutor of Corpus Christi College, Cambridge.
T. M. MACDONALD, Rector of Kersal, Manchester; Prebendary of Lincoln.
CHARLES MARSON, Vicar of Clevedon, Somerset.
JOSEPH M'CORMICK, Vicar of Hull; Canon of York; Chaplain to the Queen.
HORACE NEWTON, Vicar of Redditch and Canon of York.
A. J. Pearson, Vicar of St. Margaret's, Brighton.
H. W. WEBB-PEPLOE, Vicar of St. Paul's, South Kensington.
A. J. ROBINSON, Rector of Holy Trinity, Marylebone.
D. D. STEWART, Rector of Coulsdon; Hon. Canon of Rochester.
J. ALLAN SMITH, Vicar of Swansea; Prebendary of Lincoln.
W. J. SMITH, Vicar of St. John's, Kilburn.
T. A. STOWELL, Rector of Chorley; Hon. Canon of Manchester.
NEVILE SHERBROOKE, Vicar of Clifton.
G. S. STREATFEILD, Vicar of Immanuel Church, Streatham-common.
E. A. STUART, Vicar of St. James's, Holloway.
E. D. WICKHAM, Vicar of Holmwood, Dorking.
F. E. WIGRAM, Oak Hill House, Hampstead.
WILLIAM WILKINSON, Rector of Birmingham; Hon. Canon of Worcester.

February, 1893.

No steps, it is stated, will be taken to canvass for signatures. Clergymen whose convictions are expressed by the foregoing "declaration," and who desire to sign it, may send their names to the Rev. Walter Abbott, the Vicarage, Paddington, W.

WE are glad to observe that the Bishop of Winchester is making satisfactory progress towards recovery, and is now able to leave his bed for a few hours every day.

THE IRISH HOME RULE BILL OF 1893.

II.

IN a former paper kindly given a place in the PULPIT, some preliminary considerations were submitted, but two were left out, which are here inserted. One is the boast of O'Connell that he could "drive a coach and four through any Act of Parliament." The other is the fact, enlarged upon by Mr. Balfour, that the reasons pretended, in 1886, for casting Ireland adrift, as utterly unmanageable, do not now apply, inasmuch as Ireland has since been governed so as to ensure comparative peace and obedience to the laws, and this without any restrictions put on liberty, unless when it ran to license and crime. Pursuing the multifarious details in the new Bill one finds some of the most serious future possibilities, or rather potentialities, either left out of sight by omission, or else postponed in their incidence, so as not to disgust and alarm until too late for remedy. As to safeguards, one consists in "the veto" of the Lord Lieutenant. Now, is it not notorious that Irish Lord Lieutenants have shown themselves completely biassed and overruled by popular opinion in too many cases? Did not a Lord Lieutenant—Lord Wellesley, was it not?—rebuke Bishop Mant, when ruling over Killaloe diocese? He gave a charge to his clergy exposing the errors of the Church of Rome and the sophistries by which they were sustained. But he was ordered by the Lord Lieutenant to stop that work, and so offend no more. Did not another Lord Lieutenant, Earl Mulgrave, parade the South and West of Ireland, opening all the gaols and letting loose the offenders therein, condemned by the several juries in their counties? What can a Lord Lieutenant do in a multitude of cases very likely to occur? Let him "prorogue and dissolve the Irish Legislature." The very same men will be returned again, if not others more fiercely bent on any given object; and the carrying out of any measures to the contrary by force will be met as occurred in the Tithe War of 1832, or as when the grass lands were ploughed up by night; while the Executive will be powerless to restrain, as in the days when the Terry Alts—so called from one Terence Alt, a good Protestant farmer, who repelled a night attack on his house with great vigour and deadly effect. There is an old saying, now very applicable, namely, "*Quid leges sine moribus prosunt.*" What used to be held illegality is now to become legalised, and the shepherds dismiss the dogs, and give the flock into the charge of the wolves.

On the subject of the Executive authority and its action, one must remember that, just as the police were recently restricted in carrying their firearms, so the new police must be even more restricted. Doubtless they will be provided also with whistles to sound the alarm when they approach, and so give "the boys" notice to desist from any night attack, and then return and finish off their work in security—the Irish are such a pleasant people, so fond of jokes.

In reference to taxation, here an enormous power is given. True, "private property may not be taken without just compensation." Who is to decide what is "just?" Has not this been declared "prairie value?" But suppose it not taken; suppose that, as in the Kilkenny Parliament of 1642, "the Church" does not demand back the monastic properties, yet why may not the properties of absentees be sold for "just compensation"—nay, seized? Or else why not those of any others? And why not both be first taxed,

especially all over a certain amount, and this so heavily imposed as to become a property unable to bear the weight, and then be sold for half nothing? The first parts of this performance were favourite methods under James II.

"Aristocratic influence" (see Rawdon, "Extra Official State Papers," A.D. 1767, p. 128) "is the source of all the maladministration in that kingdom of Ireland. Rights of commonage taken away from tenants, and all presentments of such grievances are rejected by the grand juries. Nor will an Attorney-General move for redress. No inquiry after the perpetrators of crimes the most shocking, if suspected to be persons of condition; witnesses publicly bought off, escapes managed, pardons procured. Neglect of duty and false returns in the military officers connived at, barracks and fortifications falling to ruin, yet grants made to keep them up. All public works turned into flagrant jobs, and private gratifications distributed, without colour of desert or impartiality. Commitments to prison are neither restrained by law, nor limited, assaults upon the lower people, if committed by a gentleman, are never punished, the grand jury throwing out the bills. In the laying on of taxes, evident marks of partiality to the better sort, and oppression of the poorer exhibited. The hearth-money is a flagrant instance of this. and so is the coach duty. All these evils are reducible to this one—the *tyranny of the higher orders over the lower*. The redress of them on that account is exceedingly difficult, and the chief governor, who aims at it, must expect opposition from those who have the power to injure him, they being the oppressors; and he can hope for little assistance from those he serves who are the oppressed. In effect there is no House of Lords in Ireland, the Privy Council compose the second branch of the Legislature in that kingdom. The Lords must be vested with authority before the present oppressive system can be dissolved. The Judges should be directed to quash all presentments of roads or bridges or such like jobs, calculated for the accommodation of particular gentlemen and not of public utility. In fine, to encourage the lower people to look up to them for protection against the 'Squires, and to teach them something of independency." This long quotation is taken from the work of a man who was "a late Under-Secretary of State," and gives a vivid picture of Ireland a hundred years ago. To wish, or write, to continue such a system would be monstrous, but equally monstrous it would be to reconstitute it, substituting "purely democratic" for "purely aristocratic" government of that kingdom, and "the tyranny of the lower for that of the higher classes." And what of the Poor Laws? The millennium of contractors is at hand, every guardian of the poor may be, say under his brother's or farm-servants' name, a contractor. If the cows won't milk little fishes, these will come out of the cans at the poor-house gates from the rivers on the way, and won't the guardians send their grandmothers into the house, as the Hindoos deposit these same burdens by the Ganges for the crocodiles to dispose of. Human nature is an ugly animal, whether clad in frieze or in broad cloth, and why not now show what it can do when the control of an Imperial Parliament is taken off and there is *no opposition*, or none of sufficient weight in numbers, and no English or Scotch members to cry shame! The delay to settle the Irish land question for three years may be very merciful in Mr. Gladstone, and politic too. He turns his eyes away as the shark swallows its prey on his back-turning. But how are landowners to live in the meantime? Is it not the fact that very many ladies are long deprived of their annuities and charges on property, and barely exist, in deep distress. A collection in England was made in King William's time for such as these, and it must be made again, inasmuch as who is to enforce the payment of rents when a general combination is sure to refuse any payment. And so it stands for "three years."

A word may be added as to how it comes to pass that these atrocities of immoral legislation and anomalies of government come to be entertained? They are the programme of the *Liberal party*. What is a Liberal? A Liberal used to uphold the principles of the Revolution, the integrity of the State, and love well regulated liberty.

The principles of the Revolution are now subverted, and those of what Armand Carell calls "*the counter revolution*" are set up instead. King James did his best to Romanize England, destroy the Constitution, and subvert liberty. What else but this is being tried again, not by arms but by arts, not by legitimate action but by setting the Constitution against itself. The Scotch members, the Welshman, the English Radical, are each in turn offered his own bribe, if only they will join to set up the Irish Home Rule, which is but Irish Rome Rule. Do these men who care so little for subverting the rights and liberties of others care none for their own? Combining with these sham Liberals to make the first wide open, the Church of Rome will go on to make another and another in detail until Meath will be reproduced in Scotland and Kerry in England. Prey is scented, and the modern liberal will not listen. The whole thing is a repetition of the scene at the pit. The brethren of Joseph flung him in, then sold him to the Ishmaelites, and with calm content proceeded to enjoy their own creature comforts, doubtless washing their hands, and why not also saying Grace to God as pious men. Were they always equally callous, equally self-satisfied, and equally pleased with a good bargain made? Hardly so. There is a special Providence and a moral government of Almighty God still at the head of the world's affairs—strong, though the evil one may be; and ere long "they said one to another" (in bitter remorse, young Judases as they were), "We are verily guilty concerning our brother, in that we saw the anguish of his soul, when he besought us, and we would not hear, therefore this distress is come upon us." Have English, Scotch, and Welsh members the right to sell loyal Irishmen into slavery and condemn them to beggary. They may have the power if they exercise it, but God will defend the right. "*That damned town of Derry*" baffled and checked James and his army, and Enniskillen men have left on record their "acts;" also the sons of these noble sires do still live. The God who saved their forefathers lives too. Of course Mr. Gladstone is at the pinnacle of power. No man could ever stand before him, he beat or bribed him so. The same was Milo, of Crotona, until in his high pride he essayed to drive his fist into the heart of a mighty oak and rend it in twain. The oak closed in upon him and held him a prisoner. Are not these things our parable and a prophecy to be fulfilled in due time by "the hearts of oak" in their tenacity of purpose and strength of unity? But they must appeal and unite as their sires against the common traitor and great enemy of unity.

PHILIP DWYER, A.M.

P.S.—News is to hand of the disapproval of the Bill

by the American Irish, who have the dollars. This is dismal enough; but what compared with the animosity displayed by the Parnellites to the M'Carthyites? This is a fight over the spoils, not won as yet. It reminds the writer of what he saw when a boy. A band of monkeys was trained to perform a play on the stage, and all went on decorously until a wag in the gallery flung down a pocketful of nuts. The monkeys forgot their training, and fell on one another with screams, to the infinite amusement of the company.

P. D.

THE NAME "JEHOVAH." (EXODUS VI. 3.)

READ BEFORE THE BRISTOL CHURCH ASSOCIATION.

THE question as to the first knowledge of the sacred name* Jehovah has been much discussed, and those who regard its introduction into the text of Genesis as the evidence of a compiler's hand at a later date have not unnaturally found support for their theory in the statement in Exod. vi. 3, that the name Jehovah was not known to Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob. Of course if this passage means that the patriarchs were totally ignorant of the name, we have a very definite date at which to place its origin. And Josephus appears to confirm this view, as, in speaking of God's revelation of Himself to Moses in this particular incident, he uses this language: "God declares to him His peculiar name, which had never been discovered to men before, concerning which it is not lawful for me to speak." It is therefore only natural that this passage should be much disputed, and it will be proper to examine the various interpretations assigned to it. Before doing so, we propose to consider what knowledge of the name Jehovah is ascribed to the patriarchs in the Book of Genesis, and we will confine ourselves to those places where the name is either put into the mouths of the patriarchs or their knowledge distinctly affirmed. The first instance is to be found in Gen. iv. 1. Whether we take אֵת as the mark of the construct case, or render it "from" with A. V. or "by the help of" in R. V., the plain meaning of the words is that the name Jehovah was known to Adam and Eve (Gen. iv. 26): "Then began men to call upon the name of Jehovah" is understood by the Rabbis of the origin of idolatry, by others of the preaching of Enos; but, whichever explanation we accept, the words imply a knowledge of the name Jehovah in Seth's family. Lamech, the father of Noah, was familiar with the name, since he uses it in his prophecy of Noah (v. 29). The proverb current of Nimrod (x. 9), "a mighty hunter before Jehovah," shows the name to be widely known both among Cainites and Sethites. If we compare Gen. xv. 7, "I am Jehovah that brought thee out of Ur of the Chaldees," with xxiv. 7, "Jehovah, the God of heaven, that took me from my father's house, and spake unto me," the name was already known to Abram before he left the land of his nativity. We find it also used (xxiv. 31, 50) by Laban and Bethuel in speaking to Abraham's servant. Consistent with a previous knowledge of the name, we have several public recognitions of Jehovah as the God of Abraham's worship at Sechem, Bethel, Mamre, and Beersheba (xii. 7, 8; xiii 14, 18; xxi. 33). In this last passage we have the name Jehovah explained as אֵל עוֹלָם "the everlasting God." In Gen. xiv. 22, Abram speaks of Jehovah as his God to the King of Sodom; and in ch. xxvi. 28, 29, this name is known to the King of Gerar as that of Isaac's God. There are several passages which show the name to have been familiar in Abraham's household, as we find it used by Sarah, Hagar, Lot, and the steward; and (xviii. 19) we have a remarkable expression, דֶּרֶךְ יְהוָה, "the way of Jehovah," showing that the worship of God under this title was the distinguishing mark of the family religion. We have also a public recognition of this name by Isaac (xxvi. 22, 25); and the name is used both by Rebekah and Jacob (xxvii. 7, 20), as well as by Isaac himself, in the solemn blessing of Jacob (v. 27). The name was used by God to Jacob in connection with the covenant made to his fathers, and now renewed to himself (xxviii. 13), and by Jacob (v. 21), in his solemn engagement that Jehovah should be his God. We find the patriarch, in his great distress on hearing of Esau's approach with four hundred men (xxxii. 9), appealing to God under this title, as the God of his fathers and his own special protector. We have a sort of commentary on this passage in Hosea, confirming this use of Jehovah by Jacob, by the remarkable expression, "Jehovah is his memorial" (xii. 5). Objection has been taken to Jacob's knowledge of this name from his only using it once more, *i.e.*, in the final blessing (ch. xlix) of his sons; but we must remember that Jacob's profanation of the name on the occasion of his deceiving his father and brother would make him very reticent of its use; and the name was well known in his family (xxix. 32, 35; xxx. 34), and is used by Laban, in his solemn adjuration of Jacob, as the title of the Supreme Being which he would most reverence (xxxi. 49). These passages form a very strong chain of evidence throughout the whole patriarchal period, and cannot be outweighed by the occasional use of one patriarch (Jacob), or by the silence of another (Joseph). If we consider, further, the usage of El Shaddai in the Book of Genesis, we find it used by God Himself on the institution of the covenant of circumcision (xvii. 1), in Isaac's dismissal of Jacob (xxviii. 3), in Jacob's blessing of the sons of Joseph (xlviii. 3), and Joseph himself (xlix. 25), and also on another occasion by Jacob (xliii. 14), so that God Almighty is much less the peculiar name of the Supreme Being in Genesis than "Jehovah." This comparison of the respective usages of these names of God is important, because it disposes of Theodoret's view that the name Jehovah was used *proleptically* by the patriarchs, and first revealed to Moses. It also disposes of their ignorance of the name, as, if we accept the record of Genesis, we are bound to believe that they were well acquainted with it from the first. Let us now examine the statement in Exod. vi. 3: "I am Jehovah, and I appeared unto Abraham, unto Isaac, and unto Jacob as God Almighty; but by my name Jehovah I was not known to them" (R. V.). This is sufficient for our purpose, although we prefer to render the last clause, "as to my name, I was not made known to them" with the margin. Some have avoided the difficulty by taking the last clause interrogatively: "And by my name Jehovah was I not known to them?" No grammatical objection can be taken to this rendering, as the interrogative in Hebrew is only known from the context. The meaning of the passage will then be that God revealed Himself to the patriarchs by both titles, God Almighty and Jehovah,

* We use *Jehovah* because it is generally known in that form, not because this is the most probable form of the Sacred Name.

and that the name Jehovah was specially connected with the Divine covenant (v. 4). This interpretation is also in harmony with the usage of these names in Genesis. But none of the old interpreters have taken this view, and although it is tenable, the context seems in favour of some comparison between the two names of God. We have two passages in the Psalms which help us to the right interpretation of this passage: "Jehovah hath made Himself known, He hath executed judgment" (ix. 16). "He is Jehovah our God: His judgments are in all the earth" (cv. 7). The supremacy of Jehovah as the true God is shown by signal judgments, which display His faithfulness to His covenant engagements on the one side, and His power and glory on the other. The patriarchs knew God as their Guide, Guardian, and Protector, under the title of Almighty God, but they could not know Him as the fulfiller of all His gracious promises until He had shown His marvellous works in Egypt and His wonders in the field of Zoan. This meaning of God's Name Jehovah is affirmed by Jeremiah, "This once will I cause them to know Mine hand and My might, and they shall know that My Name is Jehovah" (xvi. 21). With this correspond the declarations in Exodus: "The Egyptians shall know that I am Jehovah," "In this thou shalt know that I am Jehovah." We have a further corroboration of the correctness of this interpretation in Is. lxiii., where, after dwelling on the facts of the Exodus, the prophet breaks forth into an appeal to God to vindicate His own faithfulness, "Thou, O Jehovah, art our Father, our Redeemer; from everlasting is Thy Name."

Some take *creative* power to be the root idea of the Name Jehovah, others take it to be *redemptive* power, but the Exodus combines both. Perhaps we should say that eternal self-existence is the primary idea involved in the Name, as Rabbi Bichri says: "The blessed Lord rules in the three times—past, present, and future; and the Name Jehovah alone embraces these three times." There is a remarkable passage in Genesis which has not been referred to, and we have purposely kept it to the last, *i.e.*, Gen. xxii. 14, "And Abraham called the name of that place Jehovah-Jireh." From the words which immediately follow some take the whole verse to be an addition by a later hand long afterwards, "As it is said to this day on the mount of Jehovah it shall be provided"; but as we have seen that the Name of Jehovah was in constant use in the patriarch's family, it is in perfect agreement with the rest of the history that Abraham should attach the name of Jehovah to the scene of so remarkable an experience of Divine power and faithfulness in overruling the most contradictory providences of his life.

The name of Moriah bears evidence to the same fact, unless we accept the reading of the Samaritan Pentateuch, Aquila, Symmachus and the Vulgate "terra visionis," or the LXX. rendering *τὴν γὴν ὑψηλήν*, but in the uncertainty of the traditional site this perhaps cannot be pressed. Objection has been taken to the absence of names before the Exodus with Jehovah incorporated in them, but though they certainly did not become common until much later, the name of Jochebed, Moses' mother, herself a granddaughter of Jacob, seems indisputable, as at the time of the Exodus, when Moses was eighty years of age she was probably dead, and, if living, her name would scarcely be changed to suit the revelation of the name to Moses. Perhaps some remarks are due as to the statement of Josephus, cited in the opening of the paper, as it may be urged that being himself a priest he must have known the general tradition of his time. In writing as he did for Gentiles he is not always to be depended on for his accuracy, and in this particular case, since the close of the Old Testament canon, there had been growing up gradually a superstitious reverence for the name of Jehovah, which at last ceased to be written or pronounced, so that the pronunciation of it is now lost. We cannot, therefore, accept Josephus against the testimony of Scripture, and the whole tenour of the Book of Genesis represents the patriarchs as acquainted with Jehovah as a Name of God, and indeed the name of Jehovah would have had no meaning to the Israelites if it had been entirely unknown to them. Their recognition of the Name was at once a link with their fathers, and reminded them of the promise of deliverance almost forgotten in their sufferings in Egypt, so that the view we have upheld seems confirmed by the context as well as agreeable to the facts of the record.

R. C. W. RABAN.

Reviews and Notices.

"ST. IGNATIUS AND ST. POLYCARP." Ven. Archdeacon Farrar. London: James Nisbet and Co.

THIS little pamphlet of 24 pages seems to be one of a series of lectures on Ecclesiastical History. A great deal of matter is compressed into a small compass, the criticisms are acute, and there are no astonishing adjectives. It is Archdeacon Farrar at his best, and we wish he would always write like this.

"THE EXPOSITORY TIMES." March, 1893. London; T. and T. Clark.

PROFESSOR MARSHALL'S promised paper, which we alluded to in our review of the February number of the *Expository Times*, will be chiefly interesting to those who have already read his articles in the *Expositor*, for the interesting account of the genesis of his own theory, and of how he worked it out. It also shows the value of steady work at text and concordance. We also notice with pleasure his testimony to the value of the Septuagint.

We compliment Mr. Wright on the expression of his desire to withdraw his exaggerated language in condemnation of Professor Marshall's theory, which we also noticed last month; and we shall be very glad to read his promised paper also. For we have not nailed Professor Marshall's colours to the mast; we feel the weight of his arguments, but we do not say they are unanswerable.

"THE PEOPLE'S BIBLE." Rev. Jos. Parker, D.D. Vol. XVIII. St. Matt. i.-xi. London: Hazell, Watson and Viney; and Hodder and Stoughton.

DR. PARKER is a prolific writer; volume follows volume with great rapidity, and during the short intervals the newspapers keep us aware of what he is thinking and saying. But when the amount is so great, the sad lesson of experience is that the value is seldom, if ever, very high. We suppose authors, and especially preachers, must make a choice. Either quantity, with the hope that more readers may be reached; or quality, with the hope of a more perma-

nent influence. Dr. Parker seems to prefer the former, and we gladly give full measure of praise in saying that, considering how great the quantity is, the quality is really very good.

As regards Dr. Parker's style, popularity has spoiled it. The writing is vigorous, but the style is not that of those who feel somewhat overawed by the greatness of their subject. There are some writers on things religious who have the power of so impressing their subject-matter on you, that you altogether forget the writers. That seems to us the highest excellence; but we cannot award that praise to Dr. Parker.

"Outlines of Textual Criticism applied to the New Testament. By C. E. Hammond. Oxford Clarendon Press.

This very useful handbook, which has been for more than twenty years before the public, has now reached a fifth edition. The writer notes that when it was first published in 1872, it stood alone as an introduction to the study of textual criticism, whereas now it has many competitors. It is an encouraging sign that it still holds its place, for it has all the qualities which such a work should have—short, terse, clear, impartial, and judicious; and the continued and increasing demand for it and similar books, proves that the number of those, who are at least deriving and attempting to acquire an accurate knowledge of the doubtful or disputed texts of the New Testament, is large and increasing, especially amongst the younger men. The book does not profess to be more than an introduction to a study, which is very difficult and complicated, requiring careful comparison and appreciation of an immense mass of conflicting evidence, leading in many cases to very doubtful results, and reminding the student at every turn of the painful old saying, *Ars longa vita brevis.*

The author gives an account, which is very lucid, and as full as his narrow limits would allow, of the three branches of evidence—the manuscripts, the versions, and the quotations contained in the writings of the Fathers. He aids his readers to appreciate the degree of importance which should be attached to each of these branches, and places before them those canons or rules of criticism, which the experience of scholars has laid down for the guidance of the judgment in determining the probable reading of disputed texts. This book is itself an epitome, in which all extraneous matter and superfluous verbiage has been carefully avoided, and all information condensed in the greatest possible degree, so that a reviewer finds himself quite baffled when he attempts still further to epitomise its contents. We will, therefore, only say that it gives all the information that could be given in so small a space, and indicates the sources to which the student must apply for further knowledge.

The author has very wisely not contented himself with a mere exhibition of rules and principles, which are necessarily dry and repulsive to a beginner, but has also given, in an appendix, and in other parts of his work, examples of the application of the rules to the settling of the Text in many of the most important passages, in which serious differences of readings exist, as, for example, the words about the three heavenly witnesses (1 John v. 7, 8), the woman taken in adultery (John vii. 53; viii. 11), the question between Ος and Θεός in 1 Tim. iii. 16, and the Postscript to the Gospel of St. Mark. In handling these passages, he has maintained a truly judicial impartiality, free from that bias which has often caused Christian advocates to ignore facts in order to save a piece of valuable evidence; free also from that affection for pet theories which has led many critics astray. Once only we fancied that we had caught him tripping. It was in his conclusion to his judgment on the Postscript to St. Mark (xvi. 9-20). He holds that, with regard to this passage, there are three alternatives, which we will state in his own words:—

"Is it the original conclusion? or is the original conclusion lost? or did the Gospel end originally at ἐφοβοῦντο γάρ? The third alternative is incredible."

We ask, why is it incredible that a writing should be left with an abrupt and fragmentary conclusion? We know none of the circumstances under which the document was composed. Business may have interrupted the writer: sickness or death may have stayed his hand. He may have awaited, on the important point of the Resurrection, additional information which he did not yet possess. Many important documents have been left thus incomplete. A striking example of this is the Acts of the Apostles, which close at the very moment when the great denouement of the Apostle's career is approaching, in his appearance before Nero, and the sentence which followed. How incredible it seems that an author should close his narrative just before the very crisis of his hero's fate!

This is the only case in which, after reading his book carefully, we have detected our author in a conclusion based on insufficient evidence. In all other particulars we have found him most careful, most fair, and most free from all prejudice and subjectiveness.

CORRESPONDENCE.

To the Editor of the Church of England Pulpit and Ecclesiastical Review.

HEALTH PRESERVATION: A RELIGIOUS PRESCRIPTION.

Sir,—The sermon under the above heading, in the Pulpit of Saturday, contains many valuable remarks. But another point of view is suggested to my own mind not touched upon by the preacher.

I have an earnest conviction, from experience and observation, that the health of the body depends, in an important degree, on our theological sentiments. The man who heartily believes that God has a firm purpose, with adequate resources of wisdom, love, and efficacious application, to accomplish the permanent welfare of all His intelligent creatures, possesses very potent influences in favour of his physical nature. The man who cannot find "tongues in trees, books in the running brooks, sermons in stones, and good in everything," but who discovers grounds of discontent in most that he sees, is not well situated in that respect. Those who banish God from their thoughts, or ponder with bitterness on the arrangements of Providence, and the dealings of God with Adam's race in this life and the next, are cherishing deadly agencies against their physical, as well as mental welfare. Those who fiercely and scornfully vilify and persecute the holders of bright, cheering, loving thoughts, carry within them poisonous influences tending to disease. If "a merry heart doeth good like a medicine," the

gloomy expectation of endless agony and sin for untold myriads must, and even ought, to suppress mirth. It seems to me that the members of the party called orthodox, who are confidently anticipating a heaven of rapturous felicity for themselves, while, as they profess to believe, such appalling contrasts are to be irremediably and endlessly presented in the lot of others, must have their minds awry, or their moral sense vitiated. Neither condition can be favourable to bodily health.

J. B.

Canonbury, February 27th, 1893.

THE PAGES OF SOCRATES.

SIR,—"The opening pages of Socrates," *i.e.*, those pages wherein Plato reports the discourses of his master Socrates. In the above phrase I employed one of the synthetical beauties of our language to avoid an inelegant redundancy of expression. Addison does the same; and I suppose the authority of an Addison will silence even the objection of a Murphy. In a parallel phrase, Addison writes, "*This passage of Socrates*" (*Vide Spectator*, No. 213, Prof. Morley's ed.). Any student of literature can multiply similar instances *ad libitum*. I trust I have "unearthed" a mystery of syntax to Mr. Murphy without trespassing too largely on the ground of your space, Mr. Editor.

CHARLES RICHARD PANTER.

February 25th, 1893.

CONVOCATION.

SIR,—Societies are multiplied but finality is not reached: another is needed. A society for the *Times*, that is, to enable the clergy in the Lower House of Convocation to see the *Times* newspaper when questions are mooted touching the Church and evening Communions. The clergy and laity who have discussed this matter in the *Times* have placed the legality and expediency of this innovation (?) beyond question.

Why did some of the clergy of the Lower House of Convocation send a deputation to the Bishops to debate upon it? Do they expect the Bishops to advocate fasting Communions or to declare evening Communions unlawful, contrary to the Act of 1872 which is in force, as shown by the above correspondence? It would be a good step towards better agreement if that correspondence were reprinted and sent to every incumbent in England.

ENQUIRER.

CANON HOUGHTON, vicar of West Alvington, has been elected Dean Rural of the large deanery of Woodleigh, in the diocese of Exeter, it being the ancient custom in that diocese for the clergy to elect their own Deans Rural.

THE Bishop of Durham has intimated that he will admit no one as a candidate for holy orders, except under special circumstances, who shall be over thirty years of age on the day of ordination. The Bishop further announces that candidates who are members of theological colleges, but not graduates of any University, will be required to pass the Universities' preliminary theological examination as a condition of acceptance; and that no non-graduate candidate will be accepted, except under special circumstances, who has not received systematic instruction in theology.

IN connection with the London Diocesan Church Reading Union, the Rev. W. Murdoch Johnston will lecture at Fulham Palace on Thursday, March 9th, 16th, 23rd, 30th, on Holy Scripture. The subjects for the forthcoming examination are Joshua and St. John, chap. i-xii.

AT the instance of the Bishop of Ely the Rural Deans in the archdeaconry of Sudbury have met to consider the desirability of a confederation scheme in connection with Church schools, in view of the action of the Education Department, and in the hope of preventing voluntary schools becoming board schools.

PREFERMENTS AND APPOINTMENTS.

Amys, Rev. T., B.A., Curate-in-Charge of Steeple, Dorset; Vicar of Denton, Northamptonshire.
Bellewes, Rev. George Clench, Vicar of St. Mark's, Marylebone-road; Vicar of Bishop's Tawton, Devon.
Binyon, Rev. Frederick, M.A.; Licensed Preacher in the Diocese of Exeter.
Bleaden, Rev. William Henry, Curate; Vicar of St. Mary Magdalene's, Paddington.
Borthwick, Rev. Edwin R.; Chaplain and Naval Instructor to the *Boscawen*.
Chamberlain, Rev. James S. F., M.A., Rector of Aldridge, Walsall; Rector of Staplehurst, Kent.
Crass, Rev. William, M.A; Vicar of Christ Church, Patricroft; Rector of Mareham-le-Fen, Boston, Lincolnshire.
Davies, Rev. A. M., M.A.; Vicar of Longhorseley, Morpeth.
Edwards, Rev. William, Curate; Vicar of Holy Trinity, Parr Mount, St. Helens.
Ewing, Rev. Robert, M.A., Rector of Winterslow, near Salisbury; Vicar of Holy Trinity, Trowbridge.
Fisher, Rev. William, M.A., Assistant-Master of Aysgarth Grammar-school, Bedale, Yorkshire; Principal of Bishop Broughton's Proprietary School, Armidale, New South Wales.
Fuller, Rev. Morris, B.D.; Vicar of Bishop's Tawton; Vicar of St. Mark's, Marylebone-road.
Gabriel, Rev. E., M.A., Vicar of Rocliffe; Chaplain to the High Sheriff of Cumberland.
Gardner, Rev. Richard T., M.A., formerly Curate of Pershore, Worcestershire; Perpetual Curate of St. John Baptist's, Pilling, near Garstang.
Garrett, Rev. George Henry, Vicar of Widnes; Vicar of St. Paul's, Prince's Park, Liverpool.
Good, Rev. E. H., M.A.; Chaplain to the *Edgar*.
Haking, Rev. R.; Rector of Southacre, Swaffham.
Horan, Rev. C. T.; Licensed to Officiate in the Diocese of Chester.
Houghton, Rev. Canon C. A., M.A., Vicar of West Alvington, Devon; Rural Dean of Wordleigh.
Ingleby, Rev. Arthur, M.A., late Incumbent of the Hospital Chapel, Ilford; Licensed Preacher in the Diocese of Chichester.
Johnson, Rev. George Rose; Vicar of St. James's, Birkenhead.
Jones, Rev, Herbert Edward, M.A., Rector of Knebworth, Herts; Hon. Assistant-Secretary for the St. Albans Diocese of the Waifs and Strays Society.
Kilner, Rev. Francis Charles, M.A., Vicar of Bingley; Rural Dean of South Craven.
Lewis, Rev. David Walter, late Curate of Llanvillo; Rector of Llanvillo-with-Llandefeilog Tre'rgraig, Brecon.
Lewis, Rev. John David, late Curate of Llanbadarnfawr; Vicar of Pencarreg, Carmarthen.
Lloyd, Rev. John, Curate of Corwen; Rector of Dolgelly.
Lysons, Rev. D. G., M.A.; Vicar of Deerhurst, Gloucestershire.

Lyttelton, Rev. the Hon. Arthur Temple, M.A., Warden of Selwyn College, Cambridge ; Vicar of Eccles, Manchester.
McCleverty, Rev. R., M.A., Senior Curate of the Collegiate Church, Wolverhampton ; Vicar of St. Chad's, Stafford.
McDougall, Rev. Archibald Blair, M.A. ; Licensed Preacher in the Diocese of Exeter.
Marwood, Rev. G. H. ; Chaplain and Naval Instructor to the *Royal Arthur.*
Matthews, Rev. John Ebsworth, M.A., Vicar of St. Peter's, Derby ; Surrogate for the Diocese of Southwell.
Mills, Rev. Arthur Everard ; Perpetual Curate of St. John-the-Evangelist's, Read-in-Whalley, Manchester.
Moeran, Rev. J. W. W. ; Vicar of St. Mary's, Spring Grove.
Morris, Rev. Samuel S. O., M.A. ; Chaplain and Naval Instructor to the *Victoria.*
Murphy, Rev. F. E., M.A. ; East London Clergyman.
Noel, Rev. James Coombe, Vicar of Holy Trinity, Trowbridge ; Rector of Winterslow, Salisbury.
Postance, Rev. Charles G., M.A., Senior Curate of West Kirby, Cheshire ; Vicar of Holy Trinity, Toxteth-park, Liverpool.
Prescott. Ven. John E., D.D., Archdeacon of Furness ; Surrogate for the Diocese of Carlisle.
Ram, Rev. R. Digby, M.A., Vicar of Hampton ; Rural Dean of Hampton.
Sanders, Rev. Canon, LL.D., Vicar of St. Nicholas's, Leicester ; Vicar of St. Martin's, Leicester.
Sidgwick, Rev. J. B., M.A., Rector of All Saints', Wainfleet ; Rector of St. Peter's, Ashby Parva, Lutterworth.
Somers-Cocks, Rev. H. L., M.A. ; Rector of Staple-Fitzpaine, Taunton.
Strong, Rev. John Warrington ; Rector of Bishops Caundle, and Perpetual Curate of North Wootton (by dispensation from the Archbishop of Canterbury).
Sweet, Rev. Laxon Edward, M.A., Vicar of Hullavington, Wilts ; Vicar of Bathford, Bath.
Turner, Rev. Edmund Clarke, M.A., Honorary Canon of Chester Cathedral, and Vicar of Macclesfield ; Vicar of Neston, near Chester.
Warlow, Rev. W. M., M.A. ; Rector of Henlow, Beds.

CLERICAL OBITUARY.

Beale, Rev. Edward Hill, S.S.J.E., of St. Peter's, Mazagon, Bombay, at Bombay, on the 2nd ult., aged 51.
Bennett, Rev. John, M.A., D.D., Vicar of St. Luke's, Redcliffe-square, late Vicar of St. George's, Worthing, at Worthing, suddenly, on the 24th ult.
Blyth, Rev. Edward Hamilton, Rector of Saltwood, Hythe, at 32, Finsbury-square, on the 22nd ult., aged 58.
Buttress, Rev. Allan, at Grove Rectory, Retford, Notts, on the 15th ult. (Ash Wednesday), after a brief illness, aged 52.
Clinckett, Rev. George Milleman, Canon of St. Michael's Cathedral, Barbadoes, and lately Vicar for 35 years of St. Matthew's in that island, in London, on the 24th ult., aged 70.
Dartnell, Rev. Richard Waller, B.A., for nineteen years Rector of Huish, at Huish Rectory, Pewsey, Wilts, on the 19th ult., suddenly, aged 67.
Dixon, Rev. Robert, LL.D., Vicar of Aylesbeare, formerly Head Master of the High School, Nottingham, at Teignmouth, on the 8th ult., aged 57.
Gedge, Rev. Joseph, M.A., formerly Rector of Bildeston, at the Red House, Kelvedon, on the 24th ult., aged 93.
Hewlett, Rev. Arnold Melvill, ten years Missionary in Madagascar, at Salazie, Réunion, on the 16th January, of malarial fever, aged 42.
Hutton, Rev. William Richmond, late Curate of Kirkstall, Leeds, formerly Curate of Helston, third son of the Rev. J. H. Hutton, Rector of West Heslerton, at the Rectory, Lower Hardres, Canterbury, on the 20th ult., aged 31.
Murray, Rev. William, B.A., Curate of Frampton Cotterell, and Chaplain of Chipping Sodbury Union, at Frampton Cotterell, on the 19th ult., aged 73.
Musson, Rev. Francis, Rector of Elland, on the 20th ult.
Paget, Rev. Thomas Bradley, Canon of York, and for 47 years Vicar of Welton, East Riding of Yorkshire, on the 20th ult., aged 80.
Wood, Rev. John Spicer, D.D., Rector of Marston Morteyne, Beds, late Fellow and President of St. John's College, Cambridge, on the 23rd ult., aged 69.

FIRST REMOVE THE CAUSE.

MEN frequently worry and trouble themselves a great deal in trying to cure the symptoms of vital weakness nervous exhaustion, and kindred ailments, instead of endeavouring to first remove the cause. This can be done by Mr. Harness' Electropathic Treatment without the aid of drugs. It is useless to tell sufferers to employ their minds and bodies in useful work and to forget their disorders, so long as the cause of their troubles is not removed. How can it be expected that when they are fatigued by the least exertion they can occupy themselves by studying, walking, or other exercise? Even in conversation they frequently lose the thread of it and repeatedly find their memory failing them. What can they do? Physic will not cure them—perhaps the leading physicians have fallen to afford them any relief, and they have consequently become hopeless. It is to such as these that Mr. Harness' new combined Electropathic Belt and Suspensory is so strongly recommended, as, by its gentle but continuous action, invigorating electric currents are imperceptibly generated and conveyed direct from the spinal cord to the affected parts. It is this scientifically constructed and convenient appliance which silently but surely acts upon the vital organs, and removes the cause of the patient's disease, effecting a wonderful change in his health, character, and conduct, and speedily enabling him to return to his natural tastes and habits, and enjoy once more the full vigour of youth, with all its accompanying pleasures.

We may add that this perfect Electro-medical appliance is exceedingly comfortable to wear, gives wonderful support and vitality to all the internal organs of the body, prevents chills, imparts new life and vigour to the debilitated constitution, stimulates the organic action, promotes the circulation, assists digestion, and promptly renews that vital energy, the loss of which is the first symptom of decay. Its healing properties are multifarious. It stimulates the functions of various organs, increases their secretions, gives tone to muscle and nerves, relaxes morbid contractions, improves nutrition, and effectually renews exhausted nerve force. Acting directly on the system, it sustains and assists its various functions, and thus promotes the health and vigour of the entire frame. Besides these benefits, the mind is maintained in a buoyant, cheerful state, and every faculty is stimulated to the highest condition of intellectual strength.

Gentlemen who read the above announcement have only to visit London and call at the Electropathic and Zander Institute (52, Oxford Street, W.) to be convinced of the marvellous curative powers of Electricity and Mr. Harness' perfect methods of imperceptibly applying the current. The medical officers of the establishment are in daily attendance, and may by consulted free of charge either personally or by letter.

The Church of England Pulpit.

SCIENCE AND FAITH.

By the Rev. JOHN LIGHTFOOT, M.A., D.Sc.,
Vicar of Cross Stone, Todmorden.

Sermon Preached at Cross Stone Church on Septuagesima Sunday, January 29th, 1893.

"And God said, Let us make man in our image after our likeness."—Gen. i. 26.

"And the Lord God formed man of the dust of the ground, and breathed into his nostrils the breath of life, and man became a living soul."—Gen. ii. 7.

WHATEVER opinion my hearers may have formed with reference to these earlier chapters of the Book of Genesis which are read in church on this day—whatever you think of the scientific questions as to what the origin and the beginning of all things really was, or of the literary questions as to how the documents containing the different accounts before you, came to be written and united as they are in one book, I think all will feel, and cannot help but feel, something of the stateliness and grandeur of these lessons for Septuagesima. All must feel a certain amount of reverence for them, from the mere fact that they form one of the oldest, if not the oldest, written records in the whole world. You would feel that if I did not speak to you on the subject suggested by those lessons, I had but imperfect appreciation of the meaning of "order" in Church services. Seeing that the lessons, the canticles, the anthem, the hymns, are all calculated to direct our thoughts to this subject, it would have been out of place indeed had not the sermon dealt with it also. If it should seem to some of you present that the remarks which I have to make in the course of the services of this day are of a different character from those generally occupying attention here, I would ask you at the very outset to remember that I am about to speak only of the ways of God. If it is true, as we are taught, that it is in the knowledge of God that our eternal life consists, it must always be of great importance that we should think intelligently not only of God, but of His ways and works.

There are two great questions which will always occupy the attention of the thinking man—indeed he who does not think on these things is not worthy to be called a man—and these are: (1) Whence came I, and whence came this world in which I live, and everything in it? And (2) Whither is it all going? Toward what is it all tending? What is my destiny, and not only mine, but that of the whole of this created universe? You will at once feel that these questions must always appear dark and mysterious, and that at the very best we shall have to be content with very little knowledge in relation thereto. You may have definite faith, but you must always remember that that is a very different thing from knowledge. While you have definite faith, you must be prepared to know only a little—to "walk by faith and not by sight." Thinking men—or men who are fit to be called men—divide themselves into two great classes: the scientific element prevails in one, and the philosophic in the other. Those in whom the scientific element prevails occupy themselves mostly with the origin of things, and with questions as to how these things came to be; while those in whom the philosophical, reflective spirit prevails deal mainly with the destinies of things, and consider whither things are tending. I suppose that, from their very training, the clergy are apt to be philosophical rather than scientific, and to deal more with destinies than with origins. However, it is rather the scientific side of things that is suggested this day.

Think for one moment of the facts of our own personal life. We know that when our minds go back, our recollections of early childhood are very few; yet, if we could recall all that passed in our very earliest childhood, we should find our minds were active then. No doubt what passed through our minds thus early in life might seem of very small importance to us beside the deliberate self-education of later life; but we all owe to the prehistoric period of individual life many a vague propensity to good or evil—many a lofty aspiration of which we are now conscious, and which we reverence as the voice of something higher and better than self. And it is just so with reference to the larger sphere of mankind, and of nature itself taken as a whole. Let us go back as far as history can carry us, and it is not long before we come to a period about which we can only faintly "suppose." Although we know very little of that period, the little which we are able to decipher suggests very distinctly how much the past of the race has influenced the present. Though assured beforehand of failure, there is in man, as man, a craving to know more and more about the origin of things; therefore it is not a surprising thing, that "religion" placed her answer on the first page of the Bible—that the Book which contains God's revelation to man should give an answer to the craving of which we are all conscious, *i.e.*, the desire to know something as to how this world came and how we ourselves came. I suppose it will be very generally accepted as a short statement of the case when I say that what the Bible teaches as to the origin and the purpose of man is somewhat thus: that this world and all its varied inhabitants are the direct creation of God's ow

hand, and that at the last day of earthly history all will be given back into God's own hand. If you read the best efforts of some of the foremost scientists, you may get the impression that this is a conception which it is impossible in these days for scientific men to hold. I wish my congregation to consider with me whether the truth is not that science has only taken a new and unaccustomed form of expression. You are often told that the old religious conception that the world was the direct creation of God is impossible in scientific circles to-day; but does not the old religious notion really continue to exist in its integrity? Is it not, as I have suggested, that science has adopted new forms of expression—new modes of stating the old truths? What has modern science to tell us of the origin of this world? Let us examine its assertions with all frankness. What science says to us is of immense importance. I am not here to preach against it or to endeavour to explain it away. Our business is to receive truth wherever it is to be found. As Kingsley used to say, "The only orthodoxy God cares for is the truth." Let us always, then, gladly, thankfully, reverently accept everything that is true. Let us look well into things for ourselves, in order that we may know how much really is true. While I must and do readily accept truth, it is my duty to do my utmost to remove anything that would seem to be a stumbling-block in the way of religious faith. The account of the creation starts with an earth "without form and void," over which the Spirit of God "brooded." What such words mean precisely we can only conjecture. Science, on the other hand, starts with a "sphere of heated vapour," which, with countless others like unto itself, was now whirling round in space. Science no longer marks off the periods in the world's formation as the work of six different days of the divine creation; it measures them rather, by the decrease of radiated heat, the formation of liquids, and the solidification of the earth's surface. Science no longer deduces the origin of the various living creatures from the immediate interposition of God, but ascribes them to the gradual evolution of those productions, which were brought forth, not by the visible interposition of Almighty God, but by the inherent power of primitive matter, being at first simple, and becoming increasingly complex.

The question is: Does this decide the point as to whether man and all other living things owe their existence to nature or to God's creation as set forth in the first lesson this morning, and does it decide it in any way unfavourable to the aspirations of religious faith. I think not. To repeat it in plain and simple language, the question is whether, after all that has been stated by science, has been granted or accepted as absolute fact—and it is hardly that at present—we owe our existence to nature or to the divine interposition, and whether science decides the question in any way unfavourable to the teaching of the Bible. We ought to have very clear and definite opinions as to this. I have said I think science does not decide the above question in any way unfavourable to Christian aspirations and teaching, and I will give you my reason for that conclusion. When we set to work to think about God, we find ourselves in a curious position. What do we mean when we use that little word God? We always say God is very different from man; He is a Spirit. But we can only conceive of the divine action after the analogy of human action. Being ourselves bound by limitations of which we are conscious—by physical laws and conditions—we think of God working after the way in which we ourselves work. To be sure when we express ourselves in words, we say, "God does not work as we work," and that "His ways are not our ways"; that is part of our faith, but the moment we try to think how He does work, we can only think of Him working as we ourselves do. In other words, we cannot go behind our own mental powers. We never in all our lives think a new thought. We cannot picture in our minds what we have not read about or seen. There is a limit to our thought; it is trammelled or bound down in a necessarily confined area. And so, although we believe the divine action to be independent, and although we say God does not work as men work, still we can only think and speak of Him after the analogy of a picture. Therefore it is natural and inevitable in our first efforts to think of creation by the will of God that we should translate it as meaning that God works in simple fashion, introducing order amongst disorderly, formless elements. Man can only work with his hands and by tools according to certain laws and certain rules which he does not set up and over which he has no power; therefore it is almost inevitable that we should at first think of the Creator working on the same plan, under the same laws, and with the same limitations. We can not conceive of the world being created out of nothing. We think there must have been raw matter for Him to work upon. On reflection, of course, we see at once that this is a contradiction of the fundamental idea which Christians must ever have of God; we say He was not limited—that there are no laws which He must obey. If there were such laws, there must be something superior to God. He is the highest conception of thought; if we could suppose anything higher than Him we would make Him less than God. He is pictorially represented as working after the analogy of human action, but after all it is hardly what we really mean, nor does it satisfy the religious notion. It reduces God by limitations. Even when this simple pictorial view is abandoned its influence still lingers in more refined form. We proceed to translate after the fashion of human and earthly action, "God said, Let there be light, and there was light"; for in

imagination we ascribe the same to a kind of external impetus, yet reflection assures us that such is a faulty conception which can not properly be held. What occurred at the creation was not produced by the momentum set up by the Divine breath—it was not due to the commotion caused by the sound waves of His voice; not here was creative efficacy to be found. Our faith assures us it was in the Divine will and pleasure alone that the efficacy resided, and the elements needed not to be made aware of this by a voice, in order that they should obey Him in Whom alone they had their being. We cannot think of God working as a child might. We cannot think of this beautiful world as existing somewhere in His storehouse until God called it forth; we find ourselves unable to think of God Almighty working after the fashion of a workman, shaping the world out of rough material. We therefore feel ourselves in perplexity. Leaving for the moment what science has to say, let us ask ourselves, as thinking reasonable men, what kind of spectacle the creation presented if any could have been there to have seen it. We cannot say how the world was created, but this we are entitled to say from our conception of God as a Spirit, that there could only have been seen movements which seemed to spring out of the elements themselves, increasing in complexity, and without the interposition of any visible hand. In short, the spectacle of creation proceeding from the will of God would only and could only appear as the successive evolution of things according to natural law. In that way, when faith understood its own language, the spectacle of creation would, of necessity, be the same as the picture drawn by science. It is not a question as to whether the scientific or the Bible way of looking at it is correct; we can only picture the one after the pattern of the other. The more we think of it, the clearer we shall perceive that we have had not one account here and another there — that this was the view which religious men took, and the other was the view which scientific men took. All that was absolute nonsense. Christian men could only read and interpret the one — could only think of it at all in fact—after the pattern of the other. What therefore God has joined let no man put asunder.

There is probably a deeper reason for the bitter, jealous attitude towards the scientific conception of the creation, especially as regards man, which has ever shown itself in Christian teachers. We do not like to suppose that the wonderful phenomena of life proceed from inherent powers of material elements, we fancy that more direct and express volition of God was exercised in the production of living creatures destined to passionate struggles throughout history, than in the foundation of the inanimate rocks and earth upon which they live. And surely we think some more solemn circumstances marked the creation of man, *i.e.*, some interposition of power superior to the uniform course of nature. But very little reflection should be sufficient to correct that tendency of the mind to require spectacular effects in that way, for the whole scene would be wasted, there being no one to see it. I think, however there is really a deeper ground for the opposition which a large number of religious men in all ages have felt to the teaching of absolute uniformity in God's workings. When science teaches that all things existing upon this earth have been evolved from original elements, and when it is implied that after the first creative act which set the whole thing moving, God practically withdrew His hand, all this practically means that the world is now but a big machine. The ascription of unaltering consistency and uniformity to God, however, is repugnant to the secret craving of the religious heart. To make all subsequent action in the universe the necessary result of one primal resolve involves a denial of freedom of action which seems incompatible with our belief in a personal living God. We cannot believe that all that happens now was included in God's original plan. If we really believe in God as a personal living God, we must ascribe to Him (1) capacity for doing what without His doing would never have happened, (2) preventing what would otherwise have occurred, (3) possibility of ceasing to desire what previously was desired. All this we find in our own personality, and because we are made in His likeness; faith is in inevitable hostility to a conception of God which makes Him less free than we are. Thus inevitably where religion is at all, two things will ever be distinguished. First, as to the realm of nature. In this we find necessity: things are obliged to take place in a certain way—they are governed by what are called laws of causation or unalterable, invariable laws. Secondly there is the realm of personal experience, the realm of freedom. Thus man occupies a double position: by his body he belongs to the realm of nature and is subject to its laws, and by his mind, his soul, his self-conscious life, to a higher sphere, where liberty extends, and with the interpretation of which mere physical science is incompetent to deal. The text shows man in that double aspect, stating that he was made "out of the dust of the ground," showing his affinity to nature, and "in our image," "a living soul," showing his superiority to nature. These general reflections are abundantly strengthened by facts made patent by science. You have all heard of the "physical basis of life." There are four dead lifeless elements—carbon, oxygen, nitrogen, and hydrogen. These under certain circumstances unite to form three compound bodies, viz., carbonic acid, water, and ammonia. These dead lifeless bodies, when they come together in certain definite proportions, forms protoplasm. Now everything that has life in this world is made of protoplasm. Let

us take things the most diverse—bone, muscle, hair, the blood of our bodies, and of animals, great and small; also plants, and every part of every plant. Let us analyse these in the laboratory, and we shall get protoplasm—the clay of the potter. Science dwells on the identity of the clay, and says, If I could discover the secret of that I have the secret of all life and existence. The Christian thinks of the Potter, who out of the same clay can form such wonderful diverse objects. To the latter the Potter and His design seem the most important matters. This, then, is the modern scientific reading of "Dust thou art and unto dust shalt thou return." Granted that man's body is a part of nature and subject to all its laws. Granted, further, that this body may be, as geologists and biologists affirm, the product by slow evolution from lower and simpler forms of animal life, yet thereby neither is the secret of nature's working revealed; nor is the Scriptural account of creation discredited, nor is the soul of man as the special inference of the Almighty disproved. In this materialistic age these points are vastly important. Suppose it were possible to cast one's eye back to when the dry land first appeared. In the waters somehow the elements so combined as to form the first protoplasmic cell which could display the phenomena of life. Suppose we could by actual demonstration show in stately procession the advance from that primary cell through all increasingly complex forms right up to man; even then we should not know the secret of that primary combination, still less could we understand the secret of that power which we call "natural causation," through which and by which the whole process has been carried on. Science gives a most bewildering and yet intensely interesting and important array of details which evidence "gradual evolution," but of the secret underlying all it can only say with the simplest devout Christian, "Here is the finger of God." The greatest modern scientists say that the cleavage between the organic and the inorganic is absolute in our present state of knowledge. I do *not* think we should insist that this will always remain the case; but at the same time I believe that if ever it should be proved that life proceeded from combination of dead matter, the Christian's position would be yet unassailable. The law and reason of the combination is our sure stronghold. Too often a new theory has been proclaimed as inimical to the Christian faith, yet when that theory has been established men have remembered that after all such truths were always quite possible, and that the opposition to them arose from prejudice and not from the essentials of the faith. The striking phrase, "Let the earth bring forth all manner of herbs," where plant life was ascribed to the actual operation of dead elements, would lend itself readily to the theory of the most advanced evolutionist. But it will be noticed that no such phrase was used of the creation of man; he in the perfection of his spiritual nature was the direct product of God's creative power at the last stage of the creative act. I can scarcely resist the comparison of this with geological fact. Briefly, man is by geology shown to be one of the most recent denizens of this earth. Indubitable remains of our species have not been found deeper than the later alluvial strata which are still being slowly formed. Scientifically, it may be said that man was not produced before a time in which existing climatic distinctions prevailed, and until after the vegetable and animal kingdoms had developed in all essentials the forms we see daily around us. With those larger assumptions of geology as to the dim past we have no concern. We must trust them bravely and fearlessly to the future. These assumptions are as yet so doubtful, so laden with possibilities of error, that we need not seriously consider them now. So, too, as to the future. When science assures us that in measurable distance life must disappear from this earth, we cheerfully acquiesce with its confirmation of what appears dimly foreshadowed in Holy Writ; but consideration of detail so remote and so unconnected with present duty is surely here out of place. When we draw a sharp line between the lower animals and man, not as to the body, but as to mental and spiritual endowments, the Scriptural distinction as to the origin of these receives large support from science and observation. Mr. Wallace has shown most conclusively that natural selection (which is the phrase by which we express the law of evolution) is utterly incompetent to give any explanation of the mathematical, musical, or artistic qualities of man. So too, natural selection breaks down in any attempt to deal with man's moral nature. The facts of freedom, deliberation, and all self-conscious acts distinguish man from brute life. Brute life is governed through the senses, rational life through reflection, and to kill or stifle the soul (rational life) means descent to irrational brute life. In this way—through the double aspect of man and the secret action of law—science affords abundant confirmation of the Scripture account of the origin of things and of Christian belief that "in the beginning God created" the heavens and the earth. The "how" science may illustrate, the fact is as religion teaches—all confirming our old belief that by Him were all things made that were made and without him was not anything made.

WE understand that a movement is being made to celebrate the silver jubilee of the Rev. F. J. Lyall, vicar of St. Luke's, Derby, by the presentation of a testimonial and address to the reverend gentleman.

THE Bishop of Ripon gave a missionary address at St. George's Chapel, Windsor Castle, on Sunday week. The service took place in the nave, and was attended by a good congregation.

NOTICES.

All communications respecting the Literary portion of the paper should be addressed to the Editor.

Business communications of every kind should be addressed to Mr. S. GIBBON, at the CHURCH OF ENGLAND PULPIT Office, 160, Fleet Street, London, E.C., to whom cheques and Post-office orders for subscriptions (in advance), three months, 2s., six months, 3s. 6d., twelve months, 6s. 6d., are to be made payable.

The Cases for binding Vol. XXXIV. are now ready.

FOR HEALTH AND IMMORTALITY.

The Ecclesiastical Review.

SATURDAY, MARCH 11, 1893.

A PROTEST.

WE published last week a paper of no small interest; it was a calm and deliberate protest on the part of a number of the best known and most respected English clergymen against certain points in the Lincoln judgment. It represents, in their own words, "some convictions and apprehensions," and it is to all who value the true principles of the Church of England a document of great importance. In years to come it will probably have a significance which probably even its framers do not now foreshadow.

Perhaps its most important statement is, "that we may discourage all thoughts of secession." No matter how sore may be the personal smart, no matter how deeply individual clergymen may resent what is in effect a vitiation of Protestant reform, there can be no question that the very worst thing for the Church at present is to allow indignation to ramble into secession. Time was, time is, time will be, and the inherent vitality of the Church will enable her to recover from this as from other blows. Earnest Protestants, however pained they may be at this last turn of events, will best serve their cause by quietly holding on their own course and giving the new system rope enough. The Reformed Church has weathered worse storms than this, and it is no brave man's part to abandon her. On this point the subscribers to the declaration have given sound advice, which we hope will be laid to heart.

Important also is the sharp condemnation of "the party of modern growth, whose avowed purpose it is to undo the work of the Reformation." Perhaps the statement is a little abrupt. We are not sure that they "avow" the purpose. But there can be no doubt that the present unrestful fashion of going back to manifold dubious and conflicting authorities does imply such a purpose. As the declaration goes on to say, there can be no finality with this practice. What one age or one use does not sanction another will, and there is no apparent limit to the practices which may be introduced. It is absolutely certain that the seventeenth century would have condemned every one of the innovations allowed in the nineteenth, nay, we need not go back two centuries, two generations suffice. What further changes are likely to come upon us? The subscribers "discern no signs that ritual practices will be restrained within the limits of the judgment." Precisely, because the limits are entirely fictitious, and may be destroyed by the same process of reasoning as that which created them, witness the controversy already going on about mixing the chalice. Already some advanced Ritualists contend that the ceremonious mixing of the chalice which the Archbishop of Canterbury is supposed to have condemned, he really in a manner permitted. One man says one thing, one another, and it is not common sense to suppose that the dispute will not soon extend to other points of ritual. And so the quarrel will go on as briskly as ever, the combatants having merely shifted their ground.

But the declaration closes with expressions of well-grounded and comfortable hope and encouragement to Protestants not to lose heart, but to put their best endeavours into their work, especially of education; and it is right. This phase will pass away; the shifting character of these authorities of dubious custom and tradition must soon be recognised, and people will see plainly what poor substitutes they are for the "vital, apostolic doctrines which constitute the distinguishing glory both of the English Church and English Prayer Book." Wait a little while, and we shall understand how infinitely little are these researches into and concerning the washing of cups and platters. Truly in days past has truth been vindicated in time of peril, and we cannot seriously apprehend that it will not be so again.

THE Bishop of Winchester has appointed the Rev. Archdall M. Hill, M.A., senior curate of Godalming, to be clerical organising secretary to the Winchester Diocesan Society.

THE Rev. W. M'Gowan, who has just been presented to the living of Nevendon, Essex, is totally blind, and has been from birth. He is considered to be a talented organist. He graduated at Hatfield Hall, Durham, in 1881, having been theological exhibitioner in 1879.

THE Queen has sent to the Rev. R. A. Pearce £10 towards the fund of the Deaf and Dumb Mission which he is conducting in the diocese of Winchester. Mr. Pearce is the only mute clergyman ever ordained, and was presented to the Queen shortly after he took orders.

THE IRISH HOME RULE BILL.
III.

THE case of Ireland affords material for both a comparison and a contrast with that of Hungary, Bohemia, etc., "From the beginning of the seventeenth century to that of the eighteenth (writes Dr. Wordsworth in Sequel to his letters to Mme. Cardon, pp. 214 and 202), a war of religion was waged in Hungary, Bohemia, etc., and the principal agents in this conflict, on the side of Rome, were the Jesuits." The Hungarian confession was then formulated and forced on the converts, "and men, women, nobles and citizens, were brought, either by persuasion or force, to pronounce a declaration in which they cursed their parents, and dishonoured the Name of God and Christ." The Protestants of Ireland, whether of great or little degree, have never yielded themselves by any general submission to Rome in Ireland; on the contrary, they in a body held on to the old faith of St. Patrick and the Scriptures, and converts to Rome were scarce in Ireland. It was chiefly by mixed marriages they came in, and to secure them the nominal Protestants must sign a paper, making over his or her rights as a parent, to a known adherent of Rome, as guardian of the children.

The action taken since the Emancipation Act has therefore turned rather in the direction of *wearing down* the Protestants, and making Ireland too hot for them, than of conciliating or embracing them into the profession of the Roman mission so long obtruded on Ireland. The last sixty years have consequently exhibited all the secret arts and open activities by which this result is sought to be reached. The "letters of Peter Plimley," that is, Sidney Smith, contain a sentiment, running somehow thus, "*You have no business here.*" The Irish Church has been disestablished and disendowed to please this party. The juries were made to consist of ignorant and common peasants, afraid to give a true verdict, and unwilling to displease the secret societies in their parish. This was Lord O'Hagan's Act, primary State education was more and more made one-sided to the prejudice of the Protestants. This injustice is now consummated. There is no longer national but an exclusively-exhibited Papal education in primary schools. The land question went to the point, so wittily described by Lord Dufferin as of "two men under one small blanket, pulling away for the whole of it." The Protestants and loyalists of Ireland do not now seek for Protestant ascendency. They now only deprecate *Popish ascendency.* What are "the absolute rights of individuals generally" as under the Constitution, as finally settled at the glorious Revolution? Let Blackstone recite and recount them: "Political or civil liberty, which is that of a member of society, is no other than natural liberty, so far restrained by human laws and no farther, as is necessary and expedient for the general advantage of the public." "The preservation of this inestimable benefit is the right of the meanest subject" of the Queen of England, as against the despotic action of kings, priests, parliaments, secret societies, or savage mobs, or of prime ministers at their beck. This right has been regarded as comprised under three heads, "1st. The right of *personal security* in a person's legal and uninterrupted enjoyment of his life, his limbs, his body, his health, and his reputation. 2nd. Next to personal security the law of England regards, asserts, and preserves, *the personal liberty of individuals.* This consists in the power of locomotion, of changing situations, or removing one's person to whatsoever place one's own inclination may direct, without imprisonment or restraint, unless by due course of law. . . . Of great importance to the public is the preservation of this personal liberty, for if it were once left in the power of any (even the highest) magistrate to imprison arbitarily whomever he or his officers thought proper, there would soon be an end of all other rights and immunities. The third absolute right inherent in every Englishman, is that of *property*, which consists in the free use, enjoyment and disposal of all his acquisitions without any control or diminution, save only by the laws of the land." Also, "The great Charter has declared that no freeman shall be disseized or divested of his freehold, or of his liberties or free customs, but by the judgment of his peers, or by the law of the land." It is curious to notice how these three rights are invaded by the voluntary action of silly individuals, who take on them the three vows of monastic life. "Celibacy" enforced defeats the first, "obedience" invalidates the second, and "poverty" the third.

Now how does the case stand (disclaimers to the contrary notwithstanding) of the subjects of Queen Victoria in Ireland, under the new *régime* in respect of these three fundamentai rights? The functions of the Queen, of Parliament, of the administration and of the execution of justice are nominally saved. But these are practically, if not formally, abrogated and transferred to what are called the Irish nation or people, that is, to the majority of them. And how is this majority actuated, governed, mastered? In some respects they follow their own sweet will, according to the traditions of their forebears, whose whole pride and profit consisted in cattle raids and slaughter of their neighbours; this is "the hill-side section." But in other respects, and in particular in the imported institution, framed for exercising the franchise, they are just as much slaves to the infallibility of the priests in politics as they are in religion, and they profess themselves illiterates at the polling-booths, in order that their priests, ever at hand, may make their mark on the voting papers for them. So these two divisions of action in Romano-Irish life cover just the whole of it so far as "individual right" is concerned—what between secret societies, with also sudden tumultuary action of "the boys," and political privileges exercised by a flock of sheep. This is the modern history of Ireland up to the present time. The Meath elections exhibit no new thing. Interference, dictation, and priestly assaults by words of terror and with sticks of toughness are the normal conditions at contested elections.

And here we may ask, What is the nature, policy, character, unchangeable purpose, declared intention, and constant exhibition of the Church of Rome in Ireland? Nothing short of infallibility and supremacy, both being in as high, if not a higher, strain propounded than the dark ages have groaned under. And is this the grand finale, the masterful remedy of Mr. Gladstone? How other European Powers have dealt with this usurpation is notorious. The report on the subject in 1816 is full of most valuable instruction. The events occurring since afford an absolute confirmation. But what sort of a life will be that of those liable to the action of the playful "boys" administering the "wild sports of the West," when the Irish hold sway in legislation, in administration, in execution, in

taxation, in everything? Macaulay tells, and Burton better still, what was the condition and how utter the wreck of the Protestants of the South and West of Ireland in respect of security, liberty, and property in the days of James II. And now Mr. Justice O'Brien, an ardent Roman Catholic, and once standing for Ennis borough, in solemn words, as an honest judge, finding "the attempt to defeat justice by intimidating jurors" a complete success, "declared the assizes adjourned." Judge Lawson, at Limerick, some twelve years ago, dismissed certain jurors for a like defeat of justice, and "hoped never to meet them again." The writer, having passed over thirty years of his professional life in co. Clare, can safely affirm that, but for "English law," as it used to be called, the rights of a British subject living there could not be had at all, and as it was, these were maintained with great difficulty and much failure; and the state of affairs became such that, in 1883, he left the country, as one in which the prospects of his children must inevitably have become sacrificed. He prefers now to be a humble poor curate in England to being a rector in a high position, with good income, in Clare. A few reminiscences of life in Clare for thirty years may close this paper. A curious social feature during that sojourn was that, while the Roman Catholic population declined enormously, especially before the census of 1851 and of 1861, the census of 1881 and of 1891 exhibited a heavy decrease of the Protestants, already in so slender a minority as 3¾ per cent. on the general population. These latter decreases were caused by the departure of farmers, the reducing of establishments, the cessation of trade and employments, and the non-residence of proprietors. All this came out of the Fenian and Parnellite movements. During these sad times, although there were flying divisions of the army, police protection huts, new stations, special magistrates, and winter sessions of assize—the latter to secure fair trials by unbiassed jurors—yet affairs went on in such a way as to make life intolerable and the rights of the Queen's subjects a nullity. The priests themselves were sometimes coerced and denied "their dues." Father Hartney, of Clare Castle, a worthy, quiet man, is a case in point, for refusing to join the Land League. Living opposite the County Infirmary in Ennis, the writer more than once and twice witnessed such a scene as this: Two policemen in front, then a cart with an old man on it, covered with a yellow quilt, having his legs bare, and dropping blood on the road. The wife came next, uttering the shrill Irish cry. Then two policemen closed the dismal procession. But a crowd of little boys and girls attended, making lively demonstrations of delight, and crying out, "Serve him right." This was done because some poor old herdsman or caretaker would not throw up his employer's service by order of the Land League parish club, and so he was shot in the legs. The writer knew another old man, nearly eighty years old, who was murdered while supping with his grandchildren and son. This sight drove the son insane. The writer, as chaplain, knew him in the asylum, and he used to ask, "Why did they put me in here? Sure, I never paid rent, nor ever went to church!" as if these were the two greatest offences possible. Francis Hynes, a solicitor's son, was hanged for an outrageously cold-blooded murder of one Dougherty, a caretaker, on the open road in the broad daylight of Sunday. There were many boycottings, beatings, shootings from ambush, threatening letters, and such like special methods of terrorising and getting rid of people obnoxious to the secret societies, or having interests that were objects of covetousness, or else being otherwise personally obnoxious to individuals. There was a pitched battle near Tulla with a force of police; and to intercept their return movement a hive of bees was flung under the horses after the men had got off; and for one of the horses, stung to death, the owner, Anthony Howard, got paid off the rates. A man who fired at A. G. Creagh, J.P., was let off by a terrified jury, when tried for this attempt at murder Then the policeman, who had the would-be murderer's thumb, that had been blown off by the gun exploding, safely preserved in a bottle of spirits of wine, asked the judge, "My lord, what am I to do with it?" "Oh," replied the judge, "give it back to the man in the dock. It fits him exactly, and is certainly his." The writer witnessed this scene.

Such Clare was, and such Clare is; and if these things were done under English law, what shall be done under Irish, both there and elsewhere in poor Ireland? The *Liberals* of England, who support this frantic measure, are fighting against *liberty*, and promoting *license*. Say that the Irish party makes demands subversive of the Constitution, why should not they do this when the plundering of the Protestants of Ireland is their reward for supporting Mr. Gladstone? But what of English Liberals, who join in this nefarious contract or understanding, and have hopes of slices of sacrilegious prey for themselves? Is all morality banished from our politics? Must there not be made a political reconstruction of power and party? When one English party summons the Irish vote to overcome another English party, have we not got *de novo* the Britons summoning Hengist and Horsa to beat the Picts and Scots? And Messrs. McCarthy and Redmond, our modern Hengist and Horsa, will do what their predecessors did, namely, obtain mastery and dominate over a divided and faction-driven people. To save England and liberty, there must be constituted a Protestant party—yes, a Protestant party—to defend the principles of the Reformation and Revolution, both of which are attacked, the one more especially in England, the other in Ireland, though both in each.

When Mr. Gladstone, like another Brennus, flings the Irish sword to turn the kicking beam, he must be kicked out himself. The Liberal Unionists began this work; the honest Protestants of the three kingdoms must finish it, and finally dispose of a Parliamentary oppressor, more tyrannical and unconstitutional than was King James II. himself.

PHILIP DWYER.

A GLIMPSE AT THE OLD CATHOLICS.

By ELEANOR F. COBBY.

It was my happy fortune to be staying at Bonn in the autumn of 1874, with some kind friends who had invited me to accompany them from England.

When I mention that our programme of excursions along the Rhine included a twenty miles drive up the valley of the Ahr, it will be understood that my eyes were feasted upon grand scenery.

This paper, however, is not written to air my deep enthusiasm for the Fatherland, but simply to record what I saw personally of a great religious gathering which is now a matter of history.

My friends were Nonconformists, and I belong to the Church of England, but when at Bonn we attended together the ministry of Dr. Graham of the Scotch Church, one of the most vigorous preachers that I have ever heard in my life. He called upon us one day at our rooms in the Coblenzer Strasse to ask if the gentlemen of our party would like to go with him to the conference of the Old Catholics to be held that day at the University.

The invitation was addressed only to them ; but stirred by the thought of how remarkable the occasion was, I suddenly inquired if ladies were permitted to be present.

"Oh, certainly," he replied, to my delight, and then—true to the masculine tradition of what is the one all-sufficient item of a woman's walking costume—he added, "Go and fetch your bonnet at once."

I remember asking him on the way—with intolerance that years have greatly modified—if he did not think the English clergy were wrong to take part in the conference, and I also remember that he answered me with the caution that became a canny Scotchman and the minister of a different Church.

We arrived in good time, and took our seats on some side benches, not far from the place occupied by the Anglican clergyman then resident at Bonn, who was, like ourselves, a spectator only.

My first look around assured me that the number of women present could be counted with the greatest ease, but I rejoice to remember that I made one amongst them.

It is something to reflect that I have sat within a few feet of Dr. Döllinger, and heard every word that fell from the lips of one of the most remarkable men of the nineteenth century.

I can see in imagination, as if it were only yesterday, the square table which he and Bishop Reinkens had to themselves and the little president's bell which stood upon it.

Dr. Reinkens was in those days a tall, fine, handsome man, with a beneficent expression of countenance, but Dr. Döllinger was small and slight, while his worn, clever face struck me as being the very incarnation of a subtle intellect. His smooth voice and excellent English ring yet in my ears.

The seats were arranged on three sides of a square, and the front benches of the side opposite to us were occupied by the English and American representatives of the Anglican Church.

Amongst them the fine, florid, stately Bishop of Pittsburg was prominent, also the pleasant-looking Dean of Chester, and another clergyman whose extremely refined, gentle, and intellectual face, struck me all across the hall.

I was told at the moment that this remarkable-looking man was Canon Liddon, but years afterwards I learned that my informant had been mistaken.

The proceedings of the day were opened in a manner that had not been arranged, and by a person whose name was not on the programme.

A gentleman, sitting not far from our party, rose rather suddenly to his feet, like a man who has a desperate duty to accomplish, and feels "straitened" until it is performed.

Addressing Dr. Döllinger, he requested permission to put a question to the English and American clergymen.

"Will you be good enough to speak a little louder," replied the astute German, inclining his head a little forward as if he did not hear quite distinctly the words that had been said. He was conscious all the time, I felt persuaded, that there was mischief brooding in the air from this quiet, straightforward speaker, and determined to daunt him, if possible, by the extreme and chilling politeness of his manner.

But the burning fire of strong conviction was never yet quenched by cold water, nor was it in this case.

"I wish," said the stranger, raising his voice, "to ask the English clergymen what they suppose Cranmer, Latimer, and Ridley would think of their presence here to-day."

He had done. He said not one word more, but resumed his seat amongst a momentary silence, which soon gave way to the business of the meeting.

I had never seen this gentleman before, I have never seen him since, I have never heard his name, and I should not in all probability agree with some of his opinions ; yet I must ever consider that he displayed the highest moral courage in standing up to speak as he did in the teeth of that picked assembly.

Everything went well after the president's bell was rung, with the exception of a little excitement on the part of one of the Greek deputies.

I could not be positive at this lapse of time on what subject he was worked up, but I remember that he was very much in earnest, and beat himself violently on the breast.

I keep a mental photo of him still thus engaged and talking all the while—a white-haired, venerable old man with a ruddy countenance.

At length it became necessary for Bishop Reinkens to leave his seat by Dr. Döllinger, and to see what he could do by way of pacification, and a fine conspicuous figure he made as he stood by the excited theologian, smiling, coaxing, explaining, and actually patting him on the shoulder.

At the close of the conference, it was declared, amidst breathless silence, that in future the Old Catholics intended to give the cup to the laity.

It was received with tremendous applause, and the remarkable assembly dispersed.

I naturally supposed that my personal interest in the conference was over with that day's proceedings ; but years after there came a kind of sequel, a proof that the wide world is narrow, or that our lives move individually in confined circles.

I went to reside in 1879 in the parish of South Bersted, of which the Rev. W. B. Philpot, the beloved eldest son of the Venerable Archdeacon and author of "A Pocket of Pebbles," was then vicar.

I actually sat under the ministry of this good and gifted man for at least three years, before discovering that it was he whose refined and intellectual appearance had attracted my attention at Bonn.

One day when he was officiating in the chancel of South Bersted Church, and I was separated from him by about the same distance that had divided us in the hall of the German University, the light falling probably in the same direction, all in a moment the face returned that had haunted me for years.

A little later, on comparing notes, I found that I was right in my tardy recognition. He told me that at the time he had been passing through Bonn and was, so to speak, accidentally present at the Conference, and added that he supped the same evening with Bishop Reinkens who was a most genial companion.

And death has been busy with those who met by the Rhine.

The powerful intellect of Dr. Döllinger has cease

from its useful labours, and Dr. Graham no longer delivers his grand and racy discourses to the ebbing and flowing tide of English and American visitors to the Fatherland.

And Mr. Philpot, a man whose character corresponded exactly with the beautiful expression of his countenance, sleeps his last sleep in the shadow of South Bersted Church which he loved so much, for as it drew "towards evening he passed to the other side."

CORRESPONDENCE.

To the Editor of the CHURCH OF ENGLAND PULPIT AND ECCLESIASTICAL REVIEW.

THE DECLARATION ON THE LINCOLN JUDGMENT.

SIR,—I have read with the greatest interest the declaration of fifty clergymen respecting the Lincoln judgment contained in your last number. It is thoughtful, calm, and very moderate, and its tone is such as befits conscientious men in the presence of the gravest crisis that has occurred in the Church of England since the Reformation.

But there are points in it to which I, for one, could not subscribe.

The clergymen who have signed the declaration say that, "as loyal Churchmen, they bow to the decisions of the Supreme Court."

This, I beg to submit, is precisely the thing which they ought not to do, for those judgments were clearly contrary to the whole weight of evidence. On the crucial point, which is the position of the officiating minister, the Archbishop had a plain rubric before him, directing that minister to stand "at the north side"; and the obvious meaning of these latter words was further confirmed by the universal, or almost universal, practice of the Church for three centuries. Yet he decided, in opposition to these most patent facts, that this plain rubric cannot be obeyed.

The Lords of the Privy Council did not confirm this ruling of the Archbishop, but passed it by in silence, and, adopting an entirely different explanation of the words, ruled "that it is not an ecclesiastical offence to stand at the northern part of the side which faces eastwards." Their Lordships, no doubt, meant "westwards," but, in the careless indifference which characterises their whole judgment, they made use of a wrong word.

I venture to think that judgments thus conflicting with each other, and basing themselves on two entirely different interpretations of the same words, are not deserving of respect, and ought to be met with a decided and unequivocal protest.

The other point in the declaration to which I could not subscribe is that in which the signers state that one of their objects is "to discourage all thoughts of secession."

Now there can be no doubt in the mind of any serious man that secession must always be looked upon as a sort of *ultima ratio*, to be adopted only when a situation has become absolutely intolerable to a conscientious mind.

But it must not be said or thought that that last argument is never in any case to be resorted to. None can hope that their views will have weight or influence in a moment of crisis, except those who, if need be are ready to go forth without the gate, bearing the reproach of their convictions. Amongst the signers of the declaration, some are old men, for whom the ambition of higher preferment must be dead. But there are others who have careers in the Church still open before them. Whether old, or young, or middle-aged, every one of them alike must be ready to sacrifice, if need be, his position and his career. It is only on this condition that their views will carry weight and their characters be respected.

None of us can foresee what will be the ultimate result to the Church of England of the judgments lately pronounced. But one thing is quite certain, that no man has a right to sacrifice truth to considerations of ecclesiastical policy. This is what the Judges of the two Courts have done; but in this no man with a conscience can follow them.

R.

INSPIRATION, EXCLUSIVE OR NOT?

SIR,—In so wide reaching a subject as the one which heads this letter, time is of less importance than a correct conclusion, still I regret that a month has passed and I have not answered Mr. Donaldson's objections, nor heeded his request for information on inspiration and revelation from my point of view, and the distinction which I draw between them. I now address myself readily to this task, premising that as our Church has not given any definition of inspiration, I shall not be so presumptuous as to do that; but, assuming that it is God's method of influencing men, I shall endeavour to show that it is not necessarily revelation, in a general sense, and further that there is good reason and good authority for concluding that both inspiration and revelation are of far wider import than we have hitherto been willing to allow.

Perhaps the fundamental idea in inspiration begins with the creation, its character, and God's mode of operation. The old view was that the creation was a definite act, and that the world developed without God's interference, except in rare and exceptional cases, called miracles. Hegel saw distinctly the error of the first idea, an error which the modern teaching of evolution more and more emphasises. Creation is not an act, a thing done, but an eternal movement, a thing perpetually doing. And as for the second, God does not "sit aloft seeing the world go," as Goethe sarcastically says; but, just as the Spirit is represented in Scripture as brooding upon the face of the waters of chaos, bringing life and order into the world, where all living things derive from Him the gift of life, as St. Paul pregnantly says: "In Him we live, and move, and have our being," so the world is one wide field where the unseen Divine Presence is ever working, the great immanent power in nature. For the world, with its marvellous variety of life and development, is not a cunningly contrived machine, outside which, its maker, as a transcendent power, may sit and contemplate its working; but it is an organism, passing through the most complex changes in the presence of antagonistic forces, and at all times requiring, as much as in the first day of creation, the upholding of all things by the word of God's power, that is, as I understand it, His indwelling in nature. I hasten to say that this is not Pantheism. It neither identifies God with nature, nor does it exclude His

transcendence above nature. God surely is great enough for both.

Believing then in a continuous Divine action, without interruption or weakness, in this world of ours, when the case of man is considered, the attentive contemplation of his history, especially but not exclusively of his religious history, I see the working of that indwelling Spirit. For if, as we must allow, "Every good gift cometh from above," then not religion only but "wisdom, understanding, knowledge, and all manner of workmanship," whether in metal, stone or timber (Exod. xxxi. 3), weaving and embroidery in divers colours (Exod. xxxv. 35), are from the spirit of God filling the hearts of men. In all the varied developments of science and art, from the earliest days of the "River-drift" men to the latest stellar discovery by the great "Lick" telescope, on Mount Hamilton, in California—

"Writ in the jewelled cypher of the sky,"

the Divine Spirit has ever been working in the world, in co-operation with human reason, influencing, co-operating, inspiring men, as they were willing to receive Him, with fresh activity and zeal and insight in that particular pursuit to which each devoted himself.

I have already quoted from Mr. Illingworth's article in *Lux Mundi*. I now turn to Archdeacon Wilson. In his second lecture on the "Theory of Inspiration," he says:—

"I cannot think any nation to be not under God's training for some purpose or another, because I cannot think of the world of men apart from God; while I think that the philosophy and art of the Greeks, the law-making and organising power of the Romans, the power of self-government and mechanical skill of the Anglo-Saxon race, were the result, broadly speaking, of the influence of God on man, and may be said in one sense, not without Biblical sanction, to be inspired, yet facts do point unmistakably to the Jews as the chief channel of Divine influence in religion."

Not for a moment questioning the last clause of this quotation, I wish to point out the breadth of view taken of inspiration, and how much more Catholic, in its best sense, this view is to the old one, which, itself a remnant of narrow Judaism, looks contemptuously down on all alien religions as impervious to any divine rays of light, and consigns all similarities of doctrine, faith, and practice to the work of the devil, the "ape of God," who introduced them into his mass of lies and corruption in order the more easily to seduce mankind. Happily, this low and unworthy view of God is passing away. The gifted writers of *Lux Mundi*, *pace* the Archdeacon of Taunton, take a wider survey of God's work in the world and in the religions of the world. Bishops, of such eminence as the Bishop of Durham, in his latest work, "The Gospel of Life," stretch wide the sphere of God's work from a Christian point of view, and recognise His operation in other forms and beliefs. "God alone," says he, "is self-existent: the world and man alike are real products of His creative activity. Ethnic religions, Pagan philosophies, every kind of human thought and interest, are, in their way, the medium of the activity of God, and so far have their truth." The Roman Catholic Bishop Bigandet, who studied Buddhism in Burmah, and who wrote a "Life of Gaudama," said: "It will not be deemed rash to assert that most of the moral truths prescribed by the Gospel are to be met with in the Buddhist scriptures." The Bishop of Colombo, in his recent work on Buddhism, says: 'No reader of these passages can claim for either the Old or New Testament the exclusive communication to men of the theory of disinterested kindness and the law of love." While further he adds: "The same Holy Spirit who wrote our Scriptures gave to some of the Buddhist teachers no despicable measure of insight into these truths."

Now these instructive quotations and references suggest an answer to my inquiry—Is inspiration exclusive or not? They point to a comprehensive and not an exclusive view. Will Mr. Donaldson, if he still objects, state simply and without personalities his view of inspiration, that your readers may form their own opinion on this important question?

The difference between inspiration and revelation follows as a corollary from this wider view. For as inspiration is not ecstasy, nor like the action of "a plectrum striking a lyre," nor of "a flute-player breathing into his flute," but the energising and fertilising of the individual's natural gifts, making, in religion, his insight clearer, deeper, and fuller, according to the earnestness of his endeavour in seeking after God, if haply he may find Him, so his spiritual convictions may or may not involve any general revelation of moral or spiritual truth hitherto unknown. That would depend upon the religious environment of his day. Undoubtedly inspiration involves a deeper consciousness of spiritual reality in religion, and so far would be a quasi-revelation. Churchmen who pray for "the healthful spirit of grace" pray by the same spirit, not for revelation in the general sense, but for a right judgment in all things and for the blessings which flow from the spirit of inspiration, not revelation.

F. T. P.

THE AUTHORSHIP OF THE FOURTH GOSPEL.

SIR,—In a work of mine on the Fourth Gospel, published some years since,* I observed: "Besides at least 100 words as given in the above list (which does not profess to be exhaustive) common to the two writings, there are from 150 to 200 identical or similar phrases, or combinations of words, which occur in the Apocalypse and the Fourth Gospel." These I printed in my appendix. Further research has enabled me to collect many additions. I have now a list of more than three hundred (300) coincidences of thought and language in the Apocalypse and the Fourth Gospel. In the case of about two hundred (200) of these, the expressions used in the two writings are either actually identical, or else so similar, as to be virtually identical.†

It is therefore absolutely useless for any critic who regards facts to contend for one moment that these two writings are not the product of one and the same mind. That they are so is conclusively proved by the fact that both unmistakably exhibit the very same unique idiosyncrasy. While J does not spell John, nor O,

* St. John, the Author of the Fourth Gospel." London: Nisbet, 1888.

† There are about 850 words in the Fourth Gospel, and a few more (say 900) in the Apocalypse. Many of the words in the latter, which is full of material imagery, could not be looked for in the former—"the *spiritual* Gospel," *e.g.*, *abyss*, *dragon*, *rainbow*, *lion*, *bear*, *leopard*, *eagle*, *wine-press*, *vial*, *marble*, *ivory*, *jasper*, *amethyst*, *trumpet*. There are about 350 words common to the two works, including such characteristic expressions as *to see*, *to know*, *to love*, *to hate*, *to abide*, *light*, *word*, *name*, *sign*, *judgment*.

nor H nor N, the letters J—O—H—N do spell John and no other name. Thus we are placed in possession of a fact of the greatest importance in New Testament criticism; for Baur and the Tübingen School, who have asserted that the Fourth Gospel is the work of an impostor of the second century, acknowledge the Apocalypse to be the genuine production of St. John. Hence out of their own mouth they are convicted of error.

Moreover, Professor Huxley has said: "The books of the New Testament are of unknown origin and of unknown date"; although even Strauss, "a giant of destructive criticism" (as the Bishop of Derry has called him), "whose work aroused anxiety throughout Europe" (as Dr. Wace has observed), had previously written: "It is well known that of all the Canonical books of the New Testament the Revelation of John is the one, the date of which we can determine most accurately from internal evidence. . . . . The sixth emperor (Rev. xvii. 10) existing at the time of the composition of the book can be none other than Galba, who reigned only from June 68 to January 69 A.D. The Apostle John might very easily have been living at this date." The late M. Renan also has said that the Apocalypse "directly arose out of the persecution of Nero," which commenced in A.D. 64. "The echo of this persecution," he adds, "and the allusions to the tortures suffered by the Christians are to be found in Rev. vi. 9 *et seq.*; vii. 9 *et seq.*; xii. 10-12, etc." That the Apocalypse is no mere fanciful vision but the outcome of stern realities and stubborn facts, the expression of a mind "actuated by real occasions and operating on real circumstances," is well expressed by the saying of that eminent critic, Bengel: "Without tears it was not written; without tears it cannot be understood."

The late Professor Reuss wrote: "It is a well-known fact that Justin Martyr mentions no other apostolic writer but John the author of the Apocalypse." Justin Martyr, who wrote his apologies between A.D. 139 and 161 taught at Ephesus, where he must have met Christians who had seen St. John. "Many thousands," as Olshausen says, "were acquainted with John, and must have known exactly what he wrote and what he did not write."

The late Dean Alford has pointed out that "the external evidence as to St. John's authorship of the Apocalypse is of the highest and most satisfactory kind. It was unanimous in very early times. It came from those who knew and had heard St. John himself."

One of those who knew and had heard St. John himself was Polycarp; and of Polycarp Irenæus (A.D. 180) writes: "I can recall the very place where Polycarp used to sit and teach, his frequent references to *St. John*, and to others who had seen our Lord, how he used to repeat from memory their discourses which he had heard from them concerning our Lord, His miracles and mode of teaching."

Irenæus testifies that St. John was the writer of the Apocalypse in "the most decisive terms" (Alford). All this weighty and incontrovertible testimony which places St. John's authorship of the Apocalypse beyond the slightest reasonable doubt now becomes available in support of St. John's authorship of the Fourth Gospel, inasmuch as both books are clearly shown by internal evidence to be the work of one and the same writer. Not only are we assured that "He that saw it bare record, and his record is true; and he knoweth that he saith true, that ye might believe" (John xix. 35); but we may also apply to the Gospel the words, "It was I, JOHN, who saw and heard these things" (Rev. xxii. 8).

Professor Huxley has presumed to call "the spiritual Gospel" of St. John "a theosophical romance of the first order"; though Canon Liddon has said of the last discourse that it "has been, as a matter of fact, watered by the tears of all the purest love and deepest sorrow of Christian humanity through eighteen centuries"; but neither Professor Huxley nor any other aggressive critic can henceforth speak of St. John's Gospel as "a work of unknown origin and of unknown date" unless he first annihilates the facts—(and we have Mr. Gladstone's authority for saying that "nothing can annihilate a fact")—which I have laid before your readers.

H. HEBER EVANS.

February 17th, 1893.

THE KINGDOM OF GOD AND OF HEAVEN.

SIR,—I think the reference to Matthew xix. 23, 24, in Mr. Hobson's letter published by you on 25th February, clearly proves that "the kingdom of heaven" and "the kingdom of God" are synonymous expressions.

But regarding another Scriptural expression he has fallen into a very common error—I mean in using the word "reprobate" as the antithesis of "elect." The fact, which I accept on Mr. Hobson's authority, that Gregory so uses it, only shows that what is now known as the Calvinistic heresy had already appeared. But it is not so used in Holy Scripture. The word so translated, ἀδόκιμος, occurs eight times in St. Paul, and nowhere else in Holy Scripture. It has in all these places its etymological meaning of unapproved and rejected *on trial*; it never means, as it afterwards came to mean in the Calvinistic system, rejected by arbitrary decree, before or without trial; nor is it ever formally opposed to "elect." This violent change in the meaning of a common word of obvious etymology is, to my mind, a strong presumption against the truth of the system under the influence of which the change was made.

JOSEPH JOHN MURPHY.

Belfast, March 1st, 1893.

PREFERMENTS AND APPOINTMENTS.

Adamson, Rev. E. M. J., M.A., Head Master of Sunderland High School; Licensed Public Preacher in the Diocese of Durham.

Atkinson, Rev. H. F., M.A.; Vicar of Helperthorpe, York.

Baldwin, Rev. Arthur B., Curate of Alston; Rector of Middle Chinnock, Somersetshire.

Baron, Rev. Charles William, M.A.; Licensed General Preacher in the Diocese of Lincoln.

Barton, Rev. J. F., M.A.; Vicar of Skelbrooke, Doncaster.

Bligh, Rev. the Hon. Henry, Vicar of St. James's, Hamptonhill; Perpetual Curate of Holy Trinity, Fareham, Hants.

Boscawen, Rev. Arthur, Townshend; Vicar of Exmoor, South Molton.

Bowen, Rev. David S., Curate-in-Charge of Andrew's Mission District, in the Parish of St. Thomas's, Hyde; Incumbent of Christ Church, Weston Point, Runcorn.

Bredin, Rev. Andrew Noble William, B.A.; Vicar of Shopland, Essex.

Bryans, Rev. Francis Richard, B.A.; Rector of Greatham, Hants.

Buckley, Rev. Dr.; Licensed to Officiate in the Diocese of Chester.

Buckton, Rev. T. F., M.A., Curate of Christ Church, High Harrogate; Vicar of Horsforth, Leeds.
Cartwright, Rev. Stephen Frederic, M.A.; Rector of Edgcote, Northants.
Clarke, Rev. Arthur E., Curate; Rector of All Saints', Sawley, near Derby.
Courtenay, Rev. John Manifold, B.A., Senior Curate of St. Helens; Vicar of Holy Trinity, Parr Mount.
Cunliffe, Rev. William; Vicar of St. Chrysostom's, Bradford.
Dickenson, Rev. Montagu Cecil; Rector of Dalby Yorkshire.
Gibson, Rev. George, M.A.; Rector of Little Berkhampstead, Herts
Hackett, Rev. John, B.D., Chaplain to the Forces, Third Class; Chaplain to the Forces, Second Class.
Harris, Rev. John Thomas, M.A.; Chaplain of the Isle of Thanet Union.
Herington, Rev. Sydney Sparkes, M.A.; Licensed General Preacher in the Diocese of Lincoln.
Hill, Rev. Archdall Malden, M.A., Senior Curate of Godalming; Clerical Organising Secretary to the Winchester Diocesan Society.
Hook, Rev. Walter, M.A.; Prebendary of Worminster in Wells Cathedral.
Hopwood, Rev. Walter William, M.A.; Licensed General Preacher in the Diocese of Lincoln.
Hotham, Rev. F. W., Rector of Cricket Malherbie; Vicar of Knowle St. Giles, near Chard.
Jolly, Rev. John, B.A.; Vicar of Thornton, Bradford.
Jones, Rev. David Morgan, M.A.; Vicar of St. Paul's, Llanelly.
Kirby, Rev. William Weldon, B.A.; Vicar of Curry Rivell, Taunton.
Mack, Rev. Edgar Shepheard Paston; Rector of Lammas-with-Little Hautbois, Norfolk.
Maule, Rev. George, formerly Curate of Stoughton, Guildford; Vicar of Tetsworth, Oxfordshire.
Oldfield, Rev. Edmund, Curate of St. Philip's, Salford; Rector of St. Elisabeth's, Reddish, Stockport.
Owen, Rev. John, Rector of Llandegla; Vicar o Dyserth, Rhyl.
Phillips, Rev. Thompson, M.A., Archdeacon of Furness; Surrogate for the Diocese of Carlisle.
Piggott, Rev. Charles Henry; Vicar of St. Mary's, Frome.
Rayson, Rev. W. R., M.A.; Vicar of East Coatham, Yorkshire.
Robinson, Rev. William; Vicar of Wicken, Soham, Cambridgeshire.
Sanderson, Rev. Robert William Bury, Curate of Canton, Cardiff; Vicar of Pontnewydd, Newport.
Scott, Rev. Alexander; Incumbent of Pateley Bridge, Yorkshire.
Seaver, Rev. Jonathan, M.A., Vicar of St. Mary's, Peckham; Vicar of St. John's, Upper Holloway.
Sharpe, Rev. Henry Martin, M.A., Curate of Enfield; Incumbent of St. Matthew's, Ponder's-end, Enfield.
Smith, Rev. Percy Edward, M.A., Vicar of Lenton; Vicar of Dartford, Kent.
Stansfield, Rev. Willard H., Vicar of St. Agnes's, Burmantofts, Leeds; Surrogate for the Diocese of Ripon.
Talbot, Canon Reginald T., M.A., Lecturer in Church History in the Dioceses of Ripon, Durham, and Newcastle-on-Tyne; Vicar of Millfield, Sunderland.
Vaughan-Jones, Rev. William, M.A., Curate of Wrexham; Rector of Tregynon, Montgomery.
Watts, Rev. Alan Hunter, Vicar of Dartford, Kent; Vicar of Lenton, Notts.

CLERICAL OBITUARY.

Buckle, Rev. Mathew, of Edlingham, son of Admiral Buckle, of Crawley, on the 26th ult., aged 92.
Buswell, Rev. William, for fifty-three years Rector of Widford, at Widford Rectory, on the 24th ult.
Horden, Right Rev. John, D.D., first Bishop of Moosonee, forty-five years Missionary at Moose Fort, Hudson's Bay, Canada, at Moose Fort, on January 12th, aged 65.
Huntington, Rev. Henry Edward, M.A., Assistant-Master Malvern College, at 4, College-grounds, Malvern, on the 5th inst., aged 32.
Pugh, Rev. Thomas, many years Curate of St. Sepulchre, City, at 9, Lloyd-street, W.C., on the 5th inst., aged 84.
Scroggs, Rev. Sydney Malet, M.A., late Vicar of Beech-hill, Berks, at Bishop's Teignton, on the 28th ult., aged 68.

FIRST REMOVE THE CAUSE.

MEN frequently worry and trouble themselves a great deal in trying to cure the symptoms of vital weakness nervous exhaustion, and kindred ailments, instead of endeavouring to first remove the cause. This can be done by Mr. Harness' Electropathic Treatment without the aid of drugs. It is useless to tell sufferers to employ their minds and bodies in useful work and to forget their disorders, so long as the cause of their troubles is not removed. How can it be expected that when they are fatigued by the least exertion they can occupy themselves by studying, walking, or other exercise? Even in conversation they frequently lose the thread of it and repeatedly find their memory failing them. What can they do? Physic will not cure them—perhaps the leading physicians have fallen to afford them any relief, and they have consequently become hopeless. It is to such as these that Mr. Harness' new combined Electropathic Belt and Suspensory is so strongly recommended, as, by its gentle but continuous action, invigorating electric currents are imperceptibly generated and conveyed direct from the spinal cord to the affected parts. It is this scientifically constructed and convenient appliance which silently but surely acts upon the vital organs, and removes the cause of the patient's disease, effecting a wonderful change in his health, character, and conduct, and speedily enabling him to return to his natural tastes and habits, and enjoy once more the full vigour of youth, with all its accompanying pleasures.

We may add that this perfect Electro-medical appliance is exceedingly comfortable to wear, gives wonderful support and vitality to all the internal organs of the body, prevents chills, imparts new life and vigour to the debilitated constitution, stimulates the organic action, promotes the circulation, assists digestion, and promptly renews that vital energy, the loss of which is the first symptom of decay. Its healing properties are multifarious. It stimulates the functions of various organs, increases their secretions, gives tone to muscle and nerves, relaxes morbid contractions, improves nutrition, and effectually renews exhausted nerve force. Acting directly on the system, it sustains and assists its various functions, and thus promotes the health and vigour of the entire frame. Besides these benefits, the mind is maintained in a buoyant, cheerful state, and every faculty is stimulated to the highest condition of intellectual strength.

Gentlemen who read the above announcement have only to visit London and call at the Electropathic and Zander Institute (52, Oxford Street, W.) to be convinced of the marvellous curative powers of Electricity and Mr. Harness' perfect methods of imperceptibly applying the current. The medical officers of the establishment are in daily attendance, and may by consulted free of charge either personally or by letter.

The Church of England Pulpit.

THE SECOND DEATH.

By the Rev. JAMES SILVESTER, M.A., Curate in Charge of Cublington.

Sermon Preached at St. Nicholas' Church, Cublington, Bucks, on Sunday Evening, February 5th, 1893.

"But the fearful (δειλοῖς), and unbelieving, and the abominable (ἐβδελυγμένοις), and murderers, and whoremongers, and sorcerers, and idolaters, and all liars (πᾶσι τοῖς ψευδέσι), shall have their part in the lake which burneth with fire and brimstone: which is the second death."—Rev. xxi. 8.

GOD is the Alpha and Omega of the world, the Maker and the Restorer of all things. "His work is perfect," and whatsoever has stained the fair beauty of our world, shall at length be purged away; whatsoever has shadowed its primal light shall vanish, whatsoever has perverted its moral purity and goodness, shall be destroyed. "Wickedness shall be broken as a tree," and sin shall have an end. "Every valley shall be exalted, and every mountain and hill shall be made low: and the crooked shall be made straight, and the rough places plain: and the glory of the Lord shall be revealed, and all flesh shall see it together: for the mouth of the Lord hath spoken it" (Is. xl. 4, 5). "The light of the moon shall be as the light of the sun, and the light of the sun shall be sevenfold, as the light of seven days, when the Lord bindeth up the breach of his people, and healeth the stroke of their wound" (Is. xxx. 26). God's communion with man, cut short in the earthly Eden, shall be renewed for ever in the Paradise of God. The tear of sorrow shall be dried, the dirge of mortality shall be ended, the long travail of creation shall issue in perfect life, the groan of pain shall change to songs of everlasting joy. The Lord our Redeemer maketh all things new, for at last there shall be "new heavens and a new earth, wherein dwelleth righteousness." And "He that overcometh, shall inherit all things," but the rest, as our text tells us, "shall have their part in the lake which burneth with fire and brimstone: which is the second death." As it is well said, heaven is a prepared place for a prepared people, and some we find will not be meet for the glory of the final state of man, but only for its punishment. For them there remains not rest, but pain and shame; not a second life, but a second death.

Our text brings before us—(1) the character of the lost; and (2) their final condition.

I. The Character of the Lost.—There is but one way to heaven, but there are many ways to hell. It is true that "all, like sheep, have gone astray," but "every one has turned to his own way." There are "the fearful" who have followed the way of cowardice. They would not confess Christ before men. They preferred the present evil state to that which is to come. They shrank from the cross. They chose to follow Demas in living for this present world, and Pilate in bartering the Saviour for selfish safety. They were of the number of those who cannot endure, and who through fear of men bring on themselves a snare.

There are "the unbelieving" or "the faithless" who could not take God at His word, who were dissatisfied with the plain evidence of Christianity, who did not act up to the light that was in them, but preferred sense and sight to faith and hope, and would not welcome the Saviour.

There are "the abominable" or "the abominated," who through association with wickedness and sin, are defiled in mind and conscience. Unbelief and wrong-doing are more nearly connected together than many people think. To shut out God is to let in sin, and when men have no fear of God before their eyes they are swift to do evil. It is easy then to see how the unbelieving become the abominable; and sin indulged without restraint becomes at length a raging fire and an overwhelming flood. Profession turns to hypocrisy, the conscience is seared and the heart perverted, evil is called good and good evil, until the temple of man becomes a haunt of every unclean thing, an abomination that maketh desolate.

There are "murderers" also, not merely those who have embrued their hands in the blood of their fellow-men, but those also whose hearts have been dead to the voice of pity and love, who have shut up their bowels of compassion from the poor and needy. They have trodden in the steps of the priest and the Levite in the parable, and him that had no helper they have heartlessly passed by. They have refused to believe in the neighbourhood of the whole world and the brotherhood of all mankind, and, like Dives, have left their Lazarus, wounded and sore, to shift for himself.

The "fornicators" are there also, those sinners against the laws of moral purity which teach us to keep our bodies in temperance, soberness, and chastity. They have sinned against their own body and defiled the temple of the Lord. The flesh, which should have been their servant, has been their lord, and for base sensual desire they have forfeited the life eternal.

"Sorcerers" are there likewise, who have used curious arts and familiar spirits, intruding into those things which they have not seen, vainly puffed up by their fleshly mind. They have invaded the in-

visible world, and have pried into the secrets of God. Following Satan's deceit, they find at last their lot with him, "where their worm dieth not, and the fire is not quenched."

"Idolaters," too, are there, who have followed the example of King Ahaz, of whom it is written that, though he shut up the house of Jehovah, yet the set up altars in every corner of Jerusalem (2 Chron. xxviii. 24). But there are idols of the heart as well as idols of the hand. Wealth, pleasure, talents, custom, friends, kindred, self, may represent so many ruling desires set up in the mind, like Dagon in his temple. And all who set these things above and before the kingdom of God and his righteousness incur the condemnation of idolatry, which shuts men out from the kingdom of heaven.

"All liars," also, are there. The word literally is "lies," and it includes all forms of deceit, hypocrisy, fraud, "whatsoever loveth and maketh a lie," counterfeits and shams, self-deceit, tongue-craft, the lying life. The phrase, indeed, may be intended not so much to indicate a distinct class of sins and sinners as to stamp the falseness of the seven kinds of iniquity already enumerated. The catalogue is like that of the works of the flesh named in Gal. v. 19-21, and it sets forth the tale of man's disobedience to the whole law of God. Moreover, we may trace in this succession of sins a gradation of wickedness. Men shrink from the trouble and effort of a godly life, and take refuge in unbelief. This brings them into willing association with sin, and those who sin against their brethren become sinners against their own souls, and intruders into the secret counsels of the Most High. They have practically denied the God that is above, and the result is the idolatry of the creature; and thus, in the words of St. Paul, they "change the truth of God into a lie, and worship and serve the creature more than the Creator, Who is blessed for ever" (Rom. i. 25).

Our text tells us that the lot of such in the future world will be according to their life in this. "They shall have their part in the lake which burneth with fire and brimstone: which is the second death." We have then to consider—

II. The Condition of the Lost.—A similar description of the lot of the wicked is that given by St. Paul, who tells the Thessalonians that "the Lord Jesus shall be revealed from heaven with His mighty angels, in flaming fire taking vengeance on them that know not God, and that obey not the Gospel of our Lord Jesus Christ: who shall be punished with everlasting destruction from the presence of the Lord and from the glory of his power" (2 Thess. i. 7-9). There is, as old writers say, (1) the punishment of loss, and (2) the punishment of pain.

First, the loss which the finally impenitent will undergo will be the loss of God indicated in that awful phrase, "the second death." This language is evidently intended to distinguish this state from another which may be called "the first death." But what is the first death? Not, it would seem, the separation of body and spirit in natural death. The context tells us that there shall be no more death in this sense (ver. 4); and the period to which our text refers is subsequent to the resurrection of the body. Rather does the term, "the second death," lead us to think of the first death as the present spiritual state of those who are not renewed by the Holy Spirit. Such are, to use St. Paul's language, "dead in trespasses and sins, living according to the course of this world, alienated from the life of God through the ignorance that is in them" (Eph. ii. 1, 2, and iv. 18). Separation from God, which sinners chose on earth, they find in hell, and what they thought so desirous here they find, with their quickened sensibilities, to be their sorrow there. Cut off from their former opportunities of sin and facilities for ignoring spiritual things, they are face to face with their real position, and they find in it the bitterness of death. The dream of vanity and folly and sin, from which no word or judgment could rouse them here, has vanished, and they wake up now to shame and everlasting contempt.

For this second death is an actual judgment as well as a woeful loss. "Upon the wicked God shall rain snares, fire and brimstone, and a horrible tempest: this shall be the portion of their cup" (Ps. xi. 6). That prophecy of the psalmist is now fulfilled. The language of the text seems to be drawn from the description of the overthrow of Sodom and Gomorrah. Fire is a common term in Scripture for judgment. The wise man speaks of heaping by kindness "coals of fire" on an enemy's head (Prov. xxv. 21, 22), which Chrysostom and others understand of the judgment of God incurred by that enemy if he remain implacable and impenitent. St. Paul says that "the fire (*i.e.*, of judgment) shall try every man's work of what sort it is" (1 Cor. iii. 13). Judgment, indeed, begins in this world in pain, and trial, and tribulation, and self-denial, and it is upon those who have not submitted to God's loving will and judgment here that the flame of Divine wrath will kindle hereafter. "For the time has come," says St. Peter, "that judgment must begin at the house of God, and what shall the end be of them that obey not the Gospel of God?" (1 Pet. iv. 17.)

Hell has been described as "a place which is governed on the principle of coercion or punishment."* The golden sceptre of grace shall be exchanged there for the iron rod of discipline, and they who refused to be members of the body of Christ shall be the footstool of His feet. Let us, however, remember that this chastisement is one of God's principles of government in this world, so that even in His dealings with the reprobate, He is consistent with Himself as the Almighty but All-merciful Jehovah. He is no arbitrary tyrant, but still a loving though

* See *Church Quarterly Review*, Vol. VI., pp. 54-57.

offended Father. And let us note that the punishment of the lost is regulated on a principle of government. The view of hell which makes impenitent sinners eternal rebels, and thus immortalises sin, is a perversion of the truth. Surely there shall not be one voice raised against the rule of our adorable Redeemer, when that saying shall be fulfilled: "He must reign till He hath put all enemies under his feet" (1 Cor. xv. 25). "The government shall be upon His shoulders" until all the lost, by few stripes or by many, shall own His sway. For so is the prayer of the Psalmist: "Let them be confounded and troubled for ever; yea, let them be put to shame and perish; that THEY may know that Thou, whose Name alone is Jehovah, art the most high over all the earth" (Ps. lxxxiii. 17, 18). *

But from the second death in the everlasting separation from the close fellowship of love with the Lord Jesus in heaven, from the pain and shame of that lake of fire and brimstone in the rule of the iron rod in hell, the Lord deliver us! And, blessed be God, there is deliverance for us, healing for the sick at heart in the wounds of the crucified Saviour, life even for them that are ready to perish, through faith in Jesus' Name. Yes, "there is balm in Gilead, there is a Physician there."

"O where shall rest be found,
Rest for the weary soul?
'Twere vain the ocean depths to sound,
Or pierce to either pole.

"The world can never give
The bliss for which we sigh;
'Tis not the whole of life to live,
Nor all of death to die.

"Beyond this vale of tears,
There is a life above,
Unmeasured by the flight of years,
And all that life is love.

"There is a death whose pang
Outlasts the fleeting breath.
Oh, what eternal sorrows hang
Around that second death!

"Lord God of truth and grace,
Help us that death to shun,
Lest we be banished from Thy face,
And evermore undone.

"Here would we end our quest,
Alone are found in Thee
The life of perfect love, the rest
Of immortality."

THE Carlisle Diocesan Conference will be held at Barrow-in-Furness on September 20th and 21st.

THE Bishop of Worcester, writing to the *Times* to acknowledge additional contributions which he has received on behalf of the poor clergy of his diocese, says that the whole amount received up to the present time is £303 2s.

* See this text explained in "World without End." By the Rev. Canon Garratt.

SALVATION IN CHRIST'S ATTRIBUTES.

BY ONE OF THE PAROCHIAL CLERGY OF ST. ANNE'S CHURCH, DUBLIN.

SERMON PREACHED IN ST. ANNE'S CHURCH ON SUNDAY, FEBRUARY 5TH, 1893.

"For after that in the wisdom of God the world by wisdom knew not God, it pleased God by the foolishness of preaching to save them that believe."—1 COR. i. 21.

NOTHING is more startling than the extraordinary climax to which St. Paul conducts his readers when he wishes to impress upon them the power of the Cross of Christ. It is weakness triumphing over strength; it is folly prevailing over wisdom; it is a struggle divine in its inception and progress, not because it appears to the outward eye magnificent, not because it rolls a voice of thunder across the world, at which men start and listen, but because it emanates from what is conventionally lowly and base, because in its application God hath chosen the "base things of the world, yea, the things that are not to bring to naught the things which are," because the still, small voice speaking to the heart of man is the pledge of its ultimate triumph. And this mysterious working of God on which St. Paul delights to dwell is not by any means confined to revelation. History affords us many examples of it. Some few years ago an Irish Churchman* claimed for Alexander Knox, to whose memory the east window in this church has been erected, that the Oxford movement was traceable to his influence. This claim was ridiculed by many on the ground that an Irishman without any position of great influence could never have originated a movement that stirred the whole Anglican communion to its very depths. Now, without entering into a vexed—and, for our present purpose, profitless—controversy, it is well to remember that the claim cannot be considered a ridiculous one merely for the reason I have stated, because the greatest crises in the history of the world have often arisen from the most unexpected quarters. Who was it that, at the beginning of this century, humbled Europe, made and unmade kings, and shattered to pieces long-established dynasties? Why an obscure adventurer, with no hereditary advantages of position or influence. Who,† in more recent years, has brought round a large number of the English people to attempt to solve a great political problem, which is at present unpleasantly burning, in a way to which Irish Churchmen strongly object? Who brought this question within the range of practical things? Why, an Irishman without wealth, without eloquence, without literary power, a man who wrote absolutely nothing, and yet has left his mark indelibly imprinted on the history of the empire.

* Prof. G. T. Stokes, D.D., *Contemporary Review*, August, 1887.

† See Prof. G. T. Stokes, in answer to the late Dean Church, *Guardian*, September 7, 14, 21, and 28, 1887.

And so it has been with the history of many of the greatest revolutions the world has seen. But of all the startling surprises, of all the triumphs which falsified human judgment and baffled human calculation, the progress of the Cross of Christ is unique. Let me draw your attention to-night to the extraordinary nature of its triumph, and to one prominent lesson which that triumph brings home to us.

I. The figure of the Cross, the crown of a Saviour's redeeming love, has always been associated in the minds of Christian people with a feeling of awe and loving reverence. Men have veiled the face and bowed the head in the presence of that exceeding love which passes all understanding. They have recognised in that history of Divine power, perfected in the weakness of a shameful death, a figure which appeals to man as the most august and pathetic symbol of their common salvation. But if this is so with Christian people, if the Cross is in our minds associated with feelings of joy and hope, it was linked with feelings of a very different nature in the minds of those whom St. Paul addressed.

Substitute for the word Cross, as has been suggested, some modern equivalent, such as the gallows, and you approach more nearly to the idea conveyed to them. We would fain shut our eyes to a thought which seems to us revolting; yet none the less we know as a fact of history that the Cross, which represents to us the saintly hope, the golden heroism, the supremest magnanimity of which life is capable, was regarded with feelings of intense repulsion by the Romans. For the Roman the pain was only a drop in the bitter cup which the sufferer would have to drain. It was the ignominy, the baseness of the suffering, from which he would turn in abhorrence, and the laws and constitutions of the empire only helped to confirm his loathing. The most degraded and vicious of criminals, be he a Roman citizen, never ran the risk of crucifixion. That were a shame too deep. A slave might be so punished for an offence comparatively small; but a Roman citizen, one born an inheritor of that empire which then swayed the destinies of the civilised world as no empire has ever done since, could never suffer such a degradation. He might be severely punished in a thousand different ways, but crucified never. And yet the Apostle was addressing his message to these very Romans, with their pride of a rich ancestry and their sense of a vast and world-wide pre-eminence, and bidding them fall down before this instrument of shame, and pay homage to a crucified provincial of their empire. Why the request must have seemed an outrage on their most cherished feelings, which they would assuredly spurn with that unspeakable contempt which their position seemed alike to necessitate and justify.

And could this Gospel story expect any more favourable reception from the Greek? Schooled in the beautiful and the good, ever keenly straining his eyes after the most picturesque and joyous of earth's visions, craving for an ideal happiness in art, how could he find in that plain story, so repulsive in its burden of suffering and so childish in its simplicity, that which would harmonise with his bright elasticity of spirit, or answer the requirements of one skilled in the subtleties of a philosophy which charmed and stimulated his mind in proportion as it baffled its efforts—nay, the story of the Cross was folly, unspeakable folly to the cultivated Greek. And if this was the nature of the Gospel story, it would certainly gain little from the character and reputation of him who preached it. He might indeed assert that the Gospel enthralled his whole moral being, and commended itself to him as a manifestation of truth, but what of that. Who was this Paul who advocated its claims? Was he any better than the weak representative of a weak and worthless breed? Where was the personality necessary to ensure the success of so gigantic a mission? Was not the preacher weak? They pointed in derision at his insignificant stature, his spare and worn frame, and they contrasted this weakness of bodily presence with the manly perfection of grace and strength which the victorious athletes had so often exhibited wreathed with the garlands of Isthmian pine. But was not the Apostle more than weak? He was foolish also, and his adversaries took care that he should not forget it.

How was this itinerant preacher with his wild contravention of all the most approved forms of logic and rhetoric which their schools inculcated, how could he bring home a message that would commend itself to the highly cultivated Greek. Foolishness failed to describe the position fully. The Apostle was more than foolish, he was in speech "contemptible." And did St. Paul deny the charge, nay, far from it, he delighted to emphasise the truth. This folly, this ignorance of the world's wisdom was a real qualification for him who would preach that Gospel story so simple and intelligible, that the "wayfaring man, though a fool, could not err therein." Nay, even more than this, the Apostle gloried in his folly, boasted of his infirmity, and that, too, though he saw far deeper into weakness, and scrutinised far more severely his folly than his bitterest foe.

Many were the proofs of weakness which he saw reigning within and mourned over, but one thing he knew, and of that one thing both Greek and Roman were alike ignorant. He was weak, but God was strong in him; he was foolish, but God's wisdom showed itself through his folly. And this confessed folly, this oft asserted weakness, would yet, the Apostle declared with unfaltering confidence, go forth conquering and to conquer where the wisdom and strength of the world had so invariably failed.

It is unnecessary to remind you, brethren, how

history has vindicated the Apostle's judgment, and how that which, humanly speaking, was impossible has come to pass. The simple Gospel message has conquered where the wisdom of Greece and the power of Rome alike failed, the foolish things of the world have conquered the mighty, and the simple have overcome the strong.

And how do you account for this extraordinary phenomenon, this strange paradox? St. Paul himself gives us an answer, "The world by wisdom knew not God." Great indeed was the wisdom of Greece and unrivalled the power of Rome; many were the cravings of men which they could answer, but there was one thirst infinite and unquenchable, the thirst of human beings in all ages, and that they could not satisfy, for it could only be satisfied out of the fulness of the living God. Men thirsted for God, but they had no remedy; men had been groping for God, longing to find Him, but they found Him not. Their philosophy and logic and rhetoric all had failed. They could make no response to the Psalmist's cry, "My soul is athirst for God, yea, even for the living God, when shall I come to appear before the presence of God." They could not, did not attempt to answer the question, wisdom had been found wanting, and now the foolishness of the world was to be its cure. The simple story of the Cross was to rend the veil in that world-wide temple of groping philosophies and creeds that led no whither, till the "light of the knowledge of the glory of God" came streaming forth from its inmost sanctuary, illuminating a whole world of dark and perplexing problems.

II. Brethren, I would ask you to think of one lesson, suggested by this story of the Cross, to "the Jews a stumbling-block, and unto the Greeks foolishness; but unto them which are called, both Jews and Greeks, Christ the power of God and the wisdom of God."

The simple story appeals to you and me, appeals to man in all ages, not as a being exceptionally endowed with singular mental capacities, not as one whose gifts raise him aloft on a solitary pedestal above his fellow-men, but to man as man, to man with his sins and sorrows and sufferings—in a word, this story appeals to his heart rather than his head. And if it were not so, if the Gospel history were a mere philosophy; if it required some such special endowments for its reception as qualify a man for the study of metaphysics, then would its evidence be utterly beyond the reach of many, and the poor and simple and ignorant might well plead their freedom from the obligations of a Gospel which was a mere class religion. But this Gospel is no mere philosophy; philosophers never framed it, and the philosophic mind can, of its own self, never understand it; and so the truth of the Gospel of Christ must be verified, not through the superior struggles of the intellect, but by the common heart and consciousness of humanity. Wherever there is a soul receptive of love and truth, there is a fitting auditor for the reception of the Gospel. The most weak and worn sufferer, incapable of consecutive reasoning, the most unlettered and ignorant, these constitute as valuable—shall I say more valuable?—auditors of the Gospel history than the most learned theologian, for its fitness to satisfy their needs is the strongest and most convincing proof of its truth. It is, of course, beyond question that the most scholarly are best suited for the investigation of evidences; but this scholarship, though a necessary equipment of the theologian, is no requisite for the believer in Jesus Christ. It may, indeed, imply high mental power to understand fully, in all their intricacy, the varied laws which govern harmony in the world of music, but many a man who knows nothing of such laws can sing and please others by doing so. And so, too, one may require considerable knowledge to discuss the philosophy of beauty, but no such unusual powers are needed to admire the loveliness of a blade of grass waving gently in the wind, attracting us by its subtle and delicate texture, and charming by a graceful movement which no artist can reproduce. And so, too, of this Gospel history. All may be its auditors, the learned and ignorant, the man of genius and the man of commonplace attainments, all can witness to its truth. It is deeper and broader and higher than any philosophical principle or any single aspect of theological truth; deeper, for it penetrates to the inmost recesses of the human heart; higher, for it raises our frail humanity to the throne of God; broader, for it enfolds in its loving arms all the children of men, Jews and Greeks, "barbarian, Scythian, bond and free." Open, then, your heart to it, try to fashion your lives according to its Holy Word and commandment; pray for the guidance of the Holy Spirit of God, and this simple story will be for you its own vindication. As you listen to it, the music of a divine harmony will steal in upon your soul, and a peace which is not of this world will penetrate your heart, for you will have as your own a unique and magnificent possession—a belief in that simple, foolish story of Christ crucified, whose wisdom will be your wisdom and whose strength your strength.

THE CHURCH IN WALES.—The Rev. Dr. Colles presided over the monthly meeting of the administrative committee in connection with the Anti-Liberation Society's Church Defence Leaflet and Lecture Campaign. Contributions amounting to one hundred guineas were announced, the number of publications granted to various parishes during the month. Twenty thousand arrangements are being made for a series of talks with working-men in the open air about the Church in Wales by able open-air speakers. The concluding chapters of the society's new work on the Church in Wales were read and agreed to by the committee, and will be published shortly.

NOTICES.

All communications respecting the Literary portion of the paper should be addressed to the Editor.

Business communications of every kind should be addressed to Mr. S. Gibbon, at the Church of England Pulpit Office, 160, Fleet Street, London, E.C., to whom cheques and Post-office orders for subscriptions (in advance), three months, 2s., six months, 3s. 6d., twelve months, 6s. 6d., are to be made payable.

The Cases for binding Vol. XXXIV. are now ready.

For Health and Immortality.

The Ecclesiastical Review.

SATURDAY, MARCH 18, 1893.

HOW WE ARE GOVERNED.

THE history of the present Parliament up to date is peculiar and instructive. Mr. Gladstone's ministry started with the course clear for six months, a circumstance which no doubt increased that blatant self-confidence which has all along characterised them. After the assembly of Parliament they found their majority working better than could have been expected, while the Opposition, we must confess, showed signs of apathy which occasionally resulted in feebleness. The effect of all this was more than ever to convince Mr. Gladstone and his colleagues that they were the real masters of the country, and that there would be no serious obstacles in the path they proposed to tread. Thereupon they embarked in a course of folly which, if we had not known it before, would have been enough to prove their incompetence. They began with a legislative programme of so contentious a character that the strongest, instead of the weakest, government known in our generation could hardly have hoped to carry it. But they proposed even more, to carry it at once. The mandate of the country was coolly assumed in favour of novel and almost revolutionary proposals, which were presumed to be beyond discussion. Apart from the Home Rule Bill, which Mr. Gladstone has persuaded himself, has been before the country for the past seven years or so, the assent of the electorate to the disestablishment of the Church in Wales and in Scotland, was taken for granted, and the dishonest fanaticism of a few teetotallers was palmed off as the *vox populi* of the United Kingdom. When mild protests were raised (we see now they were far too mild) they were disregarded as mere factious contrariness, and when it was no longer possible to treat them in that way, the House of Commons was invited, and expected to constitute itself a mere legislative tool in the hands of this Government of all the talents. Members were simply ordered to sit still all day, and every day, in order that ministers might do what they pleased.

Fortunately the last week has seen a change. The sudden drop of the "solid forty" to half that number has brought to his senses even "the old man obstinate." It is hard to say what he has gained by forcing on the House, to the great damage of his own authority, the extra sitting last Saturday. The Army Estimates have not been passed, the debate on the Home Rule Bill has not been brought appreciably nearer, a great hardship has been inflicted on a large number of hard-working officials, and Mr. Gladstone's own personal influence has been strained to breaking point. We have, it is to be hoped, come to the end of these unreasonable attempts on the part of a weak and discredited ministry to transform responsible government into dictatorship.

Meantime the country is waking up to the precise nature of what is being done in its name, but without its knowledge. As to Home Rule, we apprehend that Mr. Gladstone will regret to the last day of his life the fatuous self-conceit which impelled him to treat with contempt the most important, respectable, and influential deputation which has ever left the shores of Ireland.

The Welsh Suspensory Bill has begun to raise a storm which will soon be felt in the Cabinet. The proposal for Scotch Disestablishment has virtually dropped. The working-man has begun to protest against his vote being counted upon as a constant factor in Gladstonian majorities. And perhaps the most striking event of all, the political figment of the "Temperance Vote" has been exposed. For years past in all electoral matters a Temperance party has been supposed to exist as a kind of political organisation, which voted solid this way or that. Enthusiastic, we might say fanatical, teetotallers have encouraged the idea, because it gave them importance and authority; as controllers of votes, they could not otherwise have claimed. We have always believed it to be a fallacy. Doubtless there are, here and there, a few total abstainers, who honestly deem the spread of total abstinence, by any means whatever, to be above all other questions of politics. But the great majority of temperance men, be they moderate drinkers or total abstainers, treat the matter entirely non-politically, and vote with the party they favour, quite irrespective of the opinions or advice of the professional orators, who affect to consider their auditors as so many voting items, prepared to cast their suffrages as they are told. The discovery that the teetotal elector, as a rule, votes as Radical or Tory, not as teetotaller, has been publicly made at last. Relying on the fiction of the Temperance vote, the

Government have brought in a Local Veto Bill, which amounts simply to legalised oppression and robbery, although it embodies the ideal of two or three prominent fanatics in high place. It is highly improbable that this Bill will reach a second reading; it is next door to impossible for it to pass, and yet it represents the entire policy of the men who stand at the head of what purports to be the Temperance party, and wield what is represented as the Temperance vote. If the Temperance vote cannot carry through the pet measure of the leading teetotalers, with the aid of a subservient Cabinet in possession of a majority, though it be a scratch one, what on earth can it do?

The teetotalers have been found out, and will soon be thrown over, and that will be the beginning of the end of the Government. Meantime, we may well ask, How are we governed? The principle of opportunism has already been recognised; now we are face to face with worse. Mr. Gladstone's theory seems to be that the possession of a bare majority constitutes him an autocrat, and that the national representatives are not his masters, but his obedient servants; that when the Cabinet have decided that a Bill is to pass, the function of the House of Commons is to pass it. In the case of the Home Rule Bill he has decided that the second reading is to be taken before Easter; therefore the House of Commons is to do it. If, in order to do that, the Standing Orders must be entirely suspended, the House must suspend them, it must sit *de die in diem*, it must do without holidays or recess; in fact, the entire custom and tradition of our constitution must be set aside, and the constitution itself must follow. And all this without any vital necessity. In times of Imperial crisis much must be sacrificed to dispatch; but, supposing this Bill were a good Bill, and were going to confer incalculable benefits, supposing it were all its supporters say it is, and more there would be no great advantage gained by passing it a month sooner or later; and there has been no fiction even of such advantage. These autocratic demands have been made on the mere *ipse dixit* of the Prime Minister. We are unused to such practices in the United Kingdom, and therefore our constitution does not guard against them. There are no provisions about proportional majorities, and no precautions against abuse of power on the part of Governments, such as exist in all other legislatures in the world. The time has come when all honest men, who are patriots first and party men afterwards, ought to consider whether what has hitherto been one of the features in our constitution we are proudest of is not a real source of danger. Hitherto we have assumed that all political parties unite on one common ground of loyalty. That assumption is no longer justified, and we ought not, out of mere sentiment, to continue to cling to it. The lessons of the present Parliament emphasise the truth that, if the British constitution is to remain unimpaired, it must be the definite policy of its supporters to protect it with some of those safeguards which, however distasteful in theory, have in practice been found necessary in all other forms of representative government but ours.

THE IRISH HOME RULE BILL.

IV.

(*Concluded.*)

THE rationale of the Newcastle Programme is now being worked out in Parliament. It reminds one of "the trapper" in the North-West of Canada. He, a careful student of the habits and manners of the beasts of the earth, suits his proceedings to their humours, and tempts their special appetites to a nicety. For the bears he lays out honey; he can imitate to perfection the calls of certain denizens of the forest and prairie. Some beasts have a strong fancy for certain scents; with these smeared on his boots he traverses their paths, but always heads to his own shooting-stand. He digs pitfalls for some, lays poisoned meat for others, and sets wire-snares for more. He knows well how to play upon the vanity of the minx, and accordingly deposits suspended looking-glasses in the midst of snap-traps. The little fools dance in delight with themselves before these, and of course are taken. And just so among electors and Members of Parliament. Mr. Gladstone, the great trapper of men, has provided some speciality for each one's weak point, which he has gauged and is gratifying. Full well he knows how each of them has his price, now summarily exposed to lure him into acquiescence, and put him under a general obligation—parliamentary morality being now a matter of money or money's worth—or at least of vengeance.

And yet, alas for this great trapper of M.P.'s, things do not go on quite so nicely as he expected. The Labour party seems scared and suspicious. The fanatical Temperance section is fiercely encountered by the Liquor trade, furious at being "disestablished and disendowed." The "Welshers" have to meet the manly scruples of the honest loyal Dissenters among themselves and in the three kingdoms as well. Even the Parnellites show their teeth and keep their own counsel, in view of the Anti-Parnellites grabbing the whole of the Irish spoils of property and of power. The Bill also, on being analysed, is found to be rather the result of an enormous self-deception and self-contradictions endless on the part of the propounder, than a series of acceptable boons and probable benefits to any of the expected supporters of it, without drawbacks very serious indeed. Hence the urgency to drive it forward. But, on the other hand, has enough been done as yet to educate the people of England, Scotland, and even Wales, and give demonstrative proof of its impracticable character and certain injury to the highest interests, on which even partial and local advantages to be seized will absolutely depend. If so many branches of legitimate benefit are now to be wounded and lopped off, where and when must this work of wholesale spoliation, ruin and upset, terminate? As things stand we see a battle of "the have-nothings" against "the have-somethings," and of wild convulsion against decent stability. It is a gigantic game of "grab" we now have played before us, indeed against us all. Is it too much to expect that every Gladstonian

stronghold, and not merely a few large towns, may be stormed by deputations of earnest and able men, pleading for their rights, as the loyal subjects of the Queen. Surely there are men able to inform the ignorant and careless on what is inevitable in this Bill, for Irish, for English, for Scotch, for Unionist, for Imperial interests. Why not tell? How "*contrary*" even the Grattan Parliament was over the Portuguese and Regency questions, and why may not the new Gladstonian one do the same as well in everything that may conciliate a strong English Ministry or coerce a weak one, and then pocket "the rewards of divination"? The Dublin Parliament must be a "a Beggar's Opera," and why not remind of what the Kilkenny Parliament did in 1642. Mr. Beling, their Secretary, tells, in his "Aphorismical Discovery," and so does Carte in his "Life of the Duke of Ormond." How the financial impoverishment of Ireland became so acute, that a deputation was sent to offer the whole Island to the Duke of Lorraine for £30,000, but he refused this dead bargain. Also the Irish set up a national standard, of course of verdant green, with the Harp over the Crown. This is exhibited in the late edition of the performance alluded to, published by Mr. Gilbert. There are also two serious items to which attention is to be drawn. The one is *Irish finance.* Is anyone simpleton enough to hope that those Irish, under the obligations of the same religion as King James II. was, and with special proclivities and full opportunities, will not, especially considering that they are men of no fortunes, feather their nests well out of the rich plunder to be at their disposal? Surely these men will remember Curran's joke, and make it a reality, "What a grand thing to have a country to sell," or buy for a song, rather. But the Irish Member will now operate in Dublin and at Westminster. It will be like cock shooting, now with the right barrel, now with the left, knocking over his game as rising here or there. How James destroyed trade by driving the Protestant traders away, by extortions, by seizures, by enforced sales on trust, or with brass money repayments, or by means of exclusive dealings, is all recorded. And is it a wonder that now the sixty representative gentlemen engaged in Irish trade, dread the like treatment? Is it a wonder that every Chamber of Commerce in Ireland denounces the new Bill?

But let not any man of sense wonder that Mr. Gladstone refuses to receive a deputation to remonstrate. Why should he, and how dare he face them, with even his mastery of meaningless verbosity? He is not going to be prevented from putting the capitalists and manufacturers and traders of Ireland into the reach of his wolfish supporters, or anything else to save his place. So they must go elsewhere with their cries, their fears, their falling fortunes, for consolation and protection. And then, if these men, the very backbone and brain of Irish industry, are to be mulcted and fleeced in ways direct or indirect, and thus put to flight, who is to take their place, and where are the funds available to expend, or where the credit to back up these funds, in any new Irish commercial and manufacturing industries? Nothing will be made or sold but whisky, and society will consist of three classes—the priests, the distillers, and the drunkards —in new Ireland. And who is to prevent the illicit distillation of "poteen" whisky? Then, maddened by liquor, inflamed with avarice, and poisoned from fanaticism, the new typical Irishman will surely make an early example of his neighbour the Squire, and even of his old friend the "gombeen man." And who is to stand up against him, "monarch of all he surveys"? Now, with the terrible record of history before the merchants and men of business, the professional and the upper classes, is it to be thought that those, at least in the South and West, will remain to be robbed and burnt out—and who can say what else —instead of flying, as men fled on that fatal day of Tyrconnel's arrival as Lord Lieutenant, all which Macaulay describes in an awful scene? The Irish M.P.'s may be imagined by any one sincerely desirous not to expel or crush the Protestants of intelligence and means and rank; but how can they coerce their masters—the mob? No more than the leaders of the French Revolution could coerce the savage *sans culottes.* And so Ireland will be France, and Dublin Paris, red with blood of even priests and bishops. What else and how otherwise, *if the Bill passes?* A bankrupt Government and a beggarly country must prove powerful stimulants to legalised and illegalised extortion and oppression. Who wonders if Irish funds are falling, and if English capitalists refuse to put out their money on Irish securities (insecurities), as so often appears in the restrictions put on trustees of wills?

But our second item must have a place. This is the *military aspects* of the new Bill. Mr. Beling relates how the War Minister of the Kilkenny Parliament was pressed for commissions in the army by the farmers' sons, that they might go and fight the English in England. The "Volunteers" of 1782 enrolled despite the opposition of the authorities. If they had wrongs to vindicate, why may not the same be done by those having wrongs to perpetrate? Tyrconnel despoiled the Protestants of their arms; and a recent proclamation, forbidding their importation, is an eloquent forecast of the bloody times before us, and an undeniable acknowledgment of such being apprehended. Tyrconnel forbade five Protestants meeting in the streets. Now, peaceable assemblages of loyal Irishmen, to protest against the new charter of enslavement, are attended by police, taking notes of any incautious word of men—even "wise men," whom "oppression makes mad." Tyrconnel intercepted the letters of Irishmen disclosing what they suffered under, to keep the English in the dark. Mr. Gladstone and Mr. Morley turn the like expressions of complaint into open ridicule, and cook statistical reports to prove all things comparatively smooth and straight. They have also the comical classification of "Non-agrarian moonlighters," to further mislead fools; whereas the fact is that all liberty of action and activity of enterprise are so completely interrupted and overborne, that the terror-stricken loyalists and capitalists of the grazing districts, in Clare at least, do not now dare to budge or to tender for an acre of pasturage. There never could be a more apt illustration than this supplies of the old saying, "*Solitudinem faciunt, pacem appellant.*" Thus there is peace because there is paralysis, and no commotion because no motion.

But more particularly of the *Queen's army in Ireland.* What a choice of evils for commanding officers! In 1832, etc., the superior officers held commissions as magistrates, as well as their own from the King. Is this likely in future? If not, what then? What will the new Irish "J.P.'s"—grocers, attorneys, professional agitators, money-lenders, whisky vendors, and such like—do, in the event of combined attacks on the military by mobs, or in the way of surprises? And if these will not read the Riot Act, are detachments of the hated Saxon soldiery to be assassinated

wholesale? Near Kildysart, in Clare, a sergeant's guard of twelve men were slain to a man. The writer remembers well the contested elections in Clare of 1850 and 1852. In Tulla two companies of foot were drawn up in line before the court-house. Fronting these stood the following battle array: First appeared a row of little girls; then, behind these, one of full-grown women, most of them with babies in arms; behind these appeared a row of aged men. Ere long, from the back of the houses, came volley after volley of stones rained down on the troops, flung by young men from their covert place of attack. Only that a detachment of police penetrated the houses and these "boys" were dispersed, the soldiers must have fired in self-defence, and then what a howl over the bloody Saxons must have ensued! But this howl did ensue concerning Six-mile Bridge, where the troops did fire on their aggressors. In such cases the priests will do again as always before, first excite the people into fury, and then claim credit as arbiters of peace. Maybe they will not take this trouble in future. The boast of English law used to be that it was "reposed in the hands of those in whom the three grand requisites of wisdom, power, and goodness, as in the highest degree with the Supreme Being, prevailed; for (adds Blackstone) these are the eternal, immutable laws of good and evil, to which the great Creator Himself in all His dispensations conforms." But when, as now proposed for unhappy Ireland, "this law of nature, coeval with mankind and dictated by God Himself," is no longer supreme and binding, "*then no human laws are of any validity, if contrary to this*," and law-abiding, peaceable, industrious subjects of the Queen in Ireland are perfectly warranted before God and man in both opposing their imposition and resisting their infliction. And these men, if unhelped from England, will help themselves, and God Most High will help them too, as He gave victory to the Jews under the Maccabees, and to Derry under Walker and Baker. Who should not raise the cry, "God save Ireland, England, and the Empire from the hands of Mr. W. E. Gladstone!"

PHILIP DWYER.

P.S.—As Mr. Gladstone has sanctioned the principle that "M.P.'s" as representatives of constituencies, "have a mandate from them" to do or not do in cases arising for acceptance or rejection in Parliament, why do not those who disapprove of the Irish Home Rule Bill and the Welsh Suspension in particular, as preliminary to Mr. Gladstone's outrageous robbery of Churches—in fact, hanging them first and then quartering—assemble together, sign remonstrances, and send them to their Members with their names and numbers? In many cases of small majorities of Gladstonians, turned by Churchmen's careless votes, a goodly number of such remonstrants must have rather the effect of "a notice to quit," at an early date, to their Member, in case he may support these measures of wrong and robbery.

P. D.

THE Archbishop of York, after careful consideration of the aims and methods and rules of the Church Congregational Music Association, has consented to become its president. The association claims to be strictly loyal to the mind of the Church as expressed in her liturgical directions. It is absolutely neutral as regards the use of Anglican or Gregorian music, and desires to facilitate the congregational use of either.

AIMS.

BY THE REV. E. VERE HODGE, M.A., HEAD MASTER OF OAKHAM SCHOOL.

AN ADDRESS DELIVERED TO THE SCHOLARS OF OAKHAM SCHOOL.

IT is a remarkable thing what very different views have been held at different times and by different people on life—on life's uses and aims, its pains and its pleasures.

When I was thinking what subject would be suitable for the address this evening, a peculiar contrast came into my mind. On the one side there was the maxim of Horace, "Carpe diem, quam minime credula postero"—"Enjoy the day, put no trust in the morrow." On the other side, there was St. Paul's expression of his own aims in life: "Forgetting the things that are behind, and stretching forward to the things which are before, I press on towards the goal, unto the prize of the high calling of God in Christ Jesus."

This is the contrast between the aims of the heathen and of the Christian. With the heathen poet, the object of living is ease, leisure, comfort, enjoyment; the perfect life is that in which the smooth surface of happiness and prosperity is unruffled by the storms of misfortune, or even the stress of excessive delights. Even the very word he uses for to *enjoy* shows his thoughts: "*Pluck* the day," he says, "there may be no morrow; gather the rosebud, it will fade to-morrow." There is to be no feeling of responsibility for the past, no looking forward to the future, lest a cloud should throw its shadow over the horizon and mar the clear brightness of the present.

On the other hand, there is an utter difference of tone in St. Paul's words: "The present is nothing without the future; there is an unrest and impatience of the things of to day, which last so short a time"; and St. Paul eagerly stretches out to see the future, which is more real and everlasting.

There is a contrast between the mere animal life and the spiritual life. There is a motto for the lover of pleasure; there is a motto for the true Christian; for the soldier, loyal to duty.

It seems impossible that Horace's words should stand as a motto for any one in a Christian country. I do not suppose that any one would accept them and acknowledge them to be his guiding principle; but, as a matter of fact, it is the idea that rules the lives of many of ourselves. You must often have heard it said that one of the besetting sins of Englishmen is the desire for external respectability and comfort. Every day we hear the same thing. How important it is to get into a good position, and make enough money, and not have to do disagreeable work; or to have a sufficiently distinguished circle of friends, and to go into sufficiently good society. And these things seem so important, especially to young men just entering upon life, that all those things which really make life worth living fall into the background and are lost sight of. Or, again, many a one says: "I must have a good time now while I am young; I shall be busy presently, or I shall be too old to enjoy myself. 'Enjoy the day,' shall be my motto. Why should I trouble myself with disagreeables before it is necessary? They are sure to come all in good time; it will not make me bear them any better if I think of them now. So pleasure shall be my motto—for the present."

Now this, any one can see, is a very poor spirit; there is no enthusiasm about it; one cannot imagine any great thing done by those who hold such ideas. The pleasure-lover can have no enthusiasm; he can have no real energy; and yet nothing great or grand was ever accomplished without it. No deed of heroism, no act of self-denial—these belong to a very different stamp of man; they belong to men who have some set purpose in their hearts, and who are determined to give up all to carry it out. We cannot imagine a pleasure-loving man having influence over others like Sir J. Outram over the Indians, or Gordon over his savage Chinese warriors. We call a man who can influence others "a man of character." How can we train ourselves to be men of character? Simply by practice, by not always following our mere inclinations, but determining that our principles should take the lead, and our mere inclinations be subject to them.

Our life is just like a river when there is a flood; the water dashes along, carrying on with it rubbish, and logs, and whatever it can catch in its grasp. If one tries to swim through it, he can go with the stream with much less danger than if he tries to cross straight to the opposite bank; he will not meet the logs. So it is with many of us; we are frightened at the logs. We have got to get across the river somehow, but we hesitate to strike out boldly across it; we let ourselves drift down the stream, hoping that we shall be carried across by some lucky chance in good time.

School life is as busy as any kind of life in its own way. There is the work, the games, the social intercourse, not only occupying our time, but filling our thoughts, giving interests through every moment of the day. There are pleasures in abundance, and there are little troubles just enough to give a brighter colour to the pleasures; but there is very seldom a great shock which absolutely calls us away from our everyday life and makes us think. Days roll on, weeks roll on, and amidst the ordinary duties and the ordinary pleasures you are apt to forget any further duties. You may forget the duty of having a good motive for your industry or good temper; you may forget the duty of remembering others as well as yourself, the duty of sympathy, especially with the poor and miserable. Perhaps your own world and all its interests may so far cover your life that you cannot perceive the appealing picture, which is ever near you, of all those who never have felt your comforts, and never can know them, whose outlook and hope is only absence of pain and poverty.

I want to remind you to-night that this school life of yours, in which we continually urge you to activity both in work and play, is only a preparation for something beyond—something higher. You must not be content with mere outward success in it. Its prizes and rewards, its honours and distinctions, are only transient. In two or three years you will have forgotten them, engaged as you will be in the stern warfare of actual life. But still we want this activity which gains prizes and honour; we want to cultivate it and encourage it; for those who have it, if they only will think for themselves, will soon use it, and, forgetting the things which are behind, press forward to the goal—the real end and aim of life.

At your time of life you have capacities for good or evil: each way is equally open to you. There are few special attractions to evil; few great obstacles in the way of good. The bias is not strong; it rests with each of you himself to start the wheel. Do not be listless, or careless of everything outside the common routine of school life; do not let your activity be wasted only on trivial objects, shortlived excitements, or worthless pleasures; do not wait to begin your life's work till you are forced into it; but while you are still in the midst of the freedom and independence of youth and public-school life, of your own accord stop and think now and again. Be restless sometimes, and have the courage to stretch forward to higher, nobler, and more difficult tasks.

I speak these words to remind you of the serious side of life; to remind you that these sixty or seventy years which we may have here are but a portion of a vast whole, and that these four or five which we spend at school are but a stepping-stone to something much more important beyond it; and I would ask you to take every means to encourage yourselves, or to help yourselves, for, as you know full well by your experience, your efforts are fruitless without the help of One above, and that help is to be gained by prayer alone—prayer bold, sincere, and trustful.

Reviews and Notices.

"The Expositor." March, 1893. London: Hodder and Stoughton.

Dr. Halker's paper, continuing his series on the Difficult Words of Christ, has for its subject "Holy Violence." The text is St. Matt. xi. 12, and Dr. Halker has some excellent remarks. The only remark we can make is that, to us, "suffereth violence" must mean on the part of those who press into it, and could not mean anything else, except in the eyes of a German or some other person with a genius for finding riddles in high roads.

The most instructive paper is Professor Ramsay's on "About the Sixth Hour." He shows that anciently there were two days—a civil day, including a day and a night, and a natural day, viz., the period between sunrise and sunset. Now the latter was always divided into twelve parts or hours, but in summer these were about 75 minutes long, in winter about 45. In fact, an hour was the time it took the sun to get from mark to mark on the dial, and if there was no dial at hand, you *guessed* the hour. And it also follows that the sixth hour was always midday. The night had no hours, but only watches. We have made a note of this paper for reference.

Dr. Denny's "Three Motives to Repentance" is an admirable study of St. Luke xiii. It shows real insigh into the connection between the narratives.

Professor G. A. Smith has a geographical paper on Galilee. Dr. Bruce continues his series on "St. Paul's Conception of Christianity." These are good, and no doubt Professor Staunton, on the "Synoptic Problem," is good too; but it is a problem to us why people should needlessly spin so many theories on the origin of the Gospels.

The Rev. James Dixon has, with the sanction and approval of the Bishop of London, resigned the office of sub-warden to the St. Peter's Sisters, Kilburn. He hopes after Easter to take up parochial work in London, and will continue his individual spiritual work of the past six years.

CORRESPONDENCE.

To the Editor of the CHURCH OF ENGLAND PULPIT AND ECCLESIASTICAL REVIEW.

ΑΔΟΚΙΜΟΣ.

SIR,—I quite agree with Mr. Murphy as to the use of the word *ἀδόκιμος*, "reprobate," by St. Paul, viz., that he does not use it as Gregory the Great, and others before and after him, as the antithesis of "elect." When I objected to "Student's" interpretation of the word, as occurring in my quotation from Gregory, I spoke of it "as the expression is used by Gregory," and I had in mind then the fact that it is not so used in the New Testament by St. Paul. When I said that "it is, so far as I am aware, invariably used as Gregory uses it, as the antithesis of 'the elect.'" I meant "invariably used by ecclesiastical writers," and I certainly should have expressed myself more clearly than I did to that effect.

Though I think we ought to resist as much as possible the use of Scripture words in a non-Scriptural sense, yet it is easy to see how the word in question came to be used as the antithesis to "elect." Candidates for seats in Parliament, or any other desirable position, are either "elected" or "rejected." The *ἀδόκιμοι* are the "rejected," the rest are the "elected." The theologians who took that line with the word left out of sight that *ἀδόκιμος*, as used by St. Paul, means "rejected as not standing the test." It would have been better had they coined some such word as "non-elect," or simply used the expression "the rest," as St. Paul uses it in Rom. xi. 7. It was inevitable that some expression should get into use as an antithesis to "the elect."

May I remark that another very common instance of using a Scripture word in a non-Scriptural sense, and with very disastrous effect, occurs in Mr. Murphy's letter, I mean the word "heresy." He evidently uses it in the ecclesiastical sense of "heterodoxy," but in the New Testament *αἵρεσις* never means anything but a "sect" or "the making of sects." "Calvinism" may be "heterodoxy" in Mr. Murphy's eyes, but it never formed itself into a sect or "heresy" properly so-called.

For myself, I am no more Calvinistic than St. Peter, St. Paul, or St. John. But I am often reminded of the following words of the late Bishop Philpotts (of Exeter), in reply to a Statesman—Mr. G. Canning, I believe—who had been speaking slightingly of Calvinists: "To the peculiar tenets of that denomination of Christians to which you appear to allude I am very far from subscribing; but thus much I will say, that no man who knows what they really are will ever treat them with contempt. You, sir, do not appear to have yet risen above the vulgarest prejudices on this subject, else you would have known that opinions which have commended themselves to the full and firm conviction of some of the ablest, as well as holiest, men who have ever adorned our Church are not to be thus blown down by 'the whiff and wind' of the smartest piece of rhetoric ever discharged in your honourable House."

I am inclined to think that what Mr. Murphy calls "the Calvinistic heresy" has suffered greatly in reputation from its association with the doctrine of "eternal torment" for the "non-elect." Indeed, I have known of that doctrine being dubbed "Calvinism" by foolish writers and speakers, though it is well known that "eternal torment" is held by many—Romanists, Wesleyans, and others—who abhor "Calvinism," while many Calvinists utterly abjure "eternal torment."

W. T. HOBSON.

St. Barnabas' Vicarage, Douglas,
March 11th, 1893.

THE Rev. Dr. Luke not long since, owing to ill health, resigned the vicarage of St. Matthias', Earl's-court, which he had held for fourteen years. Some silver bowls were recently presented to him, his present condition necessitating a private presentation.

FUNERAL REFORM ASSOCIATION.—The Rev. Rabbi Michael Adler read a paper upon Jewish modes of burial at the monthly meeting of the Funeral Reform Association, at the Church House, Westminster, Canon Barker presiding. The Rabbi said that interments among Jews were conducted with rigid simplicity. Attached to every synagogue, as an important part of its organisation, was a burial board, which arranged all the details of every funeral, so that among Jews undertakers were unknown. The ancient custom was to bury in the earth without coffin; but for some considerable period a wooden coffin had been used, of the simplest character, unpolished, without ornaments—except, perhaps, brass handles—and without even a memorial plate. No leaden or inner sheath was ever used. No corpse was allowed to remain unburied more than two days. No second interment was permitted in the same grave. All expenditure beyond the synagogue charges, which were fixed and moderate, was strongly discountenanced. No velvet trappings, gaudy hearses, feathers, nor flowers were permitted, and no unusual eating and drinking. Storing up the dead in vaults was utterly unknown among Jews, family plots being used, surrounded by stone coping, such as the Rothschild family plot at Willesden. The burial-ground was sometimes called "the house of life," analogous to the ancient Jewish usage of calling a blind man "one who possesses a most brilliant light." The whole of the burial service was said in the chapel, the only words used at the graveside being, "May he come into his place in peace." As all religious ceremonies were conducted with covered head, no Jew was ever in the cemetery bareheaded, thus avoiding dangerous risks. Women were not allowed at the graveside. Immediately upon the coffin being lowered into the grave, the mourners standing round, beginning with the nearest relatives, cast three spadesful of earth upon the coffin. When death had arisen from an infectious disease, the greatest precautions were taken, the service being then said in the open air, and not in the chapel. Upon leaving the cemetery, each person carefully washed his hands. In moving a vote of thanks to the Rabbi, which was carried, Mr. John Leighton called attention to a model of a tent devised for the protection of mourners at the graveside.

PREFERMENTS AND APPOINTMENTS.

Atkinson, Rev. H. Percy, late Vicar of Kirby Grindalythe; Vicar of Helperthorpe, York.
Attridge, Rev. J. S., M.A.; Rector of Spennithorne, Yorkshire.
Aylwin, Rev. H., Curate of Cleator Moor; Vicar of Christ Church, Silloth, Cumberland.
Baker, Rev. E. G., B.A.; Licensed to Officiate in the Diocese of Chester.

Blaby, Rev. William George, Curate ; Rector of Kemberton and Vicar of Sutton Maddock, Salop.
Bligh, Rev. the Hon. Henry, Vicar of St. James's, Hampton-hill, Middlesex ; Vicar of Holy Trinity, Fareham.
Carpenter, Rev. J. N., M.A. ; Vice-Principal of St. Paul's Divinity School, Allahabad.
Dawson, Rev. James Edward Le Strange, M.A. ; Perpetual Curate of St. Saviour's, Roath, Cardiff.
Dingle, Rev. A. T., M.A. ; Vicar of Silksworth, Sunderland.
Dover, Rev. W. J. ; Rector of Rodmarton, Cirencester.
Flowers, Rev. John French, M.A., Vicar of Bonby, Barton-on-Humber ; Vicar of Corringham, Gainsborough.
Foster, Rev. Francis, M.A., Rector of Prendergast ; Prebendary of St. David's Cathedral.
Littleton, Rev. the Hon. Cecil James, M.A., Vicar of Penkridge ; Vicar of St. Mary's, Chesterfield.
Minchin, Rev. C. H., M.A., Rector of Castle Coombe ; Brit is Chaplain at Rotterdam.
Morgan-Brown, Rev. N. M., M.A., Succentor of Exeter Cathedral, and Master of the Choir School ; Minor Canon of St. Paul's Cathedral.
Nash, Rev. Percy Louis Charles ; Vicar of Usk, and Perpetual Curate of Monkswood (by dispensation).
Owen, Rev. Ithel George, M.A., Curate of Hallow, Worcestershire ; Rector of St. Andrew's Episcopal Church, St. Andrew's.
Ozanne, Rev. James Duncan, M.A. ; Perpetual Curate of Holy Trinity, Mossley, Cheshire.
Pugh, Rev. John, Vicar of Llanbadarn-fawr-Card ; Prebendary of Caerfarchell, in St. David's Cathedral.
Rees, Rev. John ; Perpetual Curate of Treherbert, Glamorganshire.
Rich, Rev. Charles Herbert, Curate of Dibden, Southampton ; Rector of Lethbridge, N.W.T., Canada.
Scott, Rev. Alexander, Incumbent of Pateley-bridge, Yorkshire ; Surrogate for the Diocese of Ripon.
Seabrook, Rev. Jeremiah P., M.A., Vicar of Stonesby, Leicestershire ; Rector of Waltham-on-the-Wolds, Melton Mowbray.
Seaver, Rev. William, Curate-in-Charge of Ruardean, Gloucestershire ; Vicar of Felixstowe, Suffolk.
Seeley, Rev. G. H. ; Licensed to Officiate in the Diocese of Chester.
Smith, Rev. Ernest F. H., M.A. ; Chaplain and Naval Instructor to the *Britannia* (temporarily).
Uppleby, Rev. G. C., Vicar of Corringham, Gainsborough ; Vicar of Bonby, Barton-on-Humber.
Westall, Rev. L. S., Curate of Hockerill ; Vicar of Thaxted, Essex.
Williams, Rev. Roger, Rector of Llanedy, Carmarthenshire ; Rural Dean of Kidwelly.
Williams, Rev. William, late Rector of Dolgelly, and Diocesan Missioner in the Diocese of St. Davids ; Prebendary of St. Nicholas Penffoes in St. David's Cathedral.
Williams, Rev. Edmund Nelson Goddard, M.A. ; Vicar of Ketteringham, Norfolk.
Wilson, Rev. Cyril Fitzroy, M.A., lately Rector of Stowlangtoft, Suffolk ; Permission to Officiate in the Diocese of Salisbury.
Wimberley, Rev. Charles Frederick Arabin, M.A., Head Master of Chard School ; permission to Officiate in the Diocese of Bath and Wells.
Woodhouse, Rev. Thomas Edward ; Rector of Whitwel, Oakham.
Wright, Rev. W. H. ; Perpetual Curate of St. George's, Worthing.
Young, Rev. Frederick ; Rector of Llanfoist, Abergavenny.

CLERICAL OBITUARY.

Ding, Rev. W., British Consular Chaplain, at Pernambuco, Brazil, on the 24th ult., aged 38.
Harrison, Rev. David John, thirty-one years Rector of Ludgvan, on the 10th inst., aged 72.
Portman, Rev. Fitzhardinge Berkeley, at Orchard Portman, Taunton, on the 6th inst., aged 82.
Smith, Rev. Richard Prowde, late of Cheltenham College, at Whittonstall Rectory, on the 11th inst., aged 49.
Wharton, Rev. William Fitzwilliam, formerly Rector of Barmingham, at Villa San Valentino, Mentone, on the 9th inst., aged 82.

FIRST REMOVE THE CAUSE.

MEN frequently worry and trouble themselves a great deal in trying to cure the symptoms of vital weakness nervous exhaustion, and kindred ailments, instead of endeavouring to first remove the cause. This can be done by Mr. Harness' Electropathic Treatment without the aid of drugs. It is useless to tell sufferers to employ their minds and bodies in useful work and to forget their disorders, so long as the cause of their troubles is not removed. How can it be expected that when they are fatigued by the least exertion they can occupy themselves by studying, walking, or other exercise? Even in conversation they frequently lose the thread of it and repeatedly find their memory failing them. What can they do? Physic will not cure them—perhaps the leading physicians have fallen to afford them any relief, and they have consequently become hopeless. It is to such as these that Mr. Harness' new combined Electropathic Belt and Suspensory is so strongly recommended, as, by its gentle but continuous action, invigorating electric currents are imperceptibly generated and conveyed direct from the spinal cord to the affected parts. It is this scientifically constructed and convenient appliance which silently but surely acts upon the vital organs, and removes the cause of the patient's disease, effecting a wonderful change in his health, character, and conduct, and speedily enabling him to return to his natural tastes and habits, and enjoy once more the full vigour of youth, with all its accompanying pleasures.

We may add that this perfect Electro-medical appliance is exceedingly comfortable to wear, gives wonderful support and vitality to all the internal organs of the body, prevents chills, imparts new life and vigour to the debilitated constitution, stimulates the organic action, promotes the circulation, assists digestion, and promptly renews that vital energy, the loss of which is the first symptom of decay. Its healing properties are multifarious. It stimulates the functions of various organs, increases their secretions, gives tone to muscle and nerves, relaxes morbid contractions, improves nutrition, and effectually renews exhausted nerve force. Acting directly on the system, it sustains and assists its various functions, and thus promotes the health and vigour of the entire frame. Besides these benefits, the mind is maintained in a buoyant, cheerful state, and every faculty is stimulated to the highest condition of intellectual strength.

Gentlemen who read the above announcement have only to visit London and call at the Electropathic and Zander Institute (52, Oxford Street, W.) to be convinced of the marvellous curative powers of Electricity and Mr. Harness' perfect methods of imperceptibly applying the current. The medical officers of the establishment are in daily attendance, and may by consulted free of charge either personally or by letter.

The Church of England Pulpit.

WORDS OF CONSOLATION.

By Ven. Archdeacon FARRAR, D.D., F.R.S.

Sermon Preached in St. Paul's Cathedral on Sunday, February 5th, 1893.

"There may be many that say, Who will show us any good? Lord, lift Thou up the light of Thy countenance upon us."—Psalms iv. 6.

THERE is a wonderful depth of experience, a wonderful deep beauty and comfort in the Songs of David. It has sometimes been asked what can be gained by singing through again and again, month after month, these ancient songs of Jewish kings and priests, who lived in circumstances so different from our own? The answer is that the heart of men in all ages and in all ranks, and under whatever different circumstances, still remains the same in its joys and sorrows, in its hopes and fears. And again, it has been asked how, in singing the Psalms, we can pass in the space of a few moments from moods which vary from passionate anger to tender humility, from perfect trustfulness to wild despair? The practice of generations has solved that question. The soul of man is not like the sea waves, of which the floating reflections are scattered the next instant by the ripple and the breeze. Impressions abide with us, words linger in our memories, and thus our recollections become like those oracular gems on Aaron's breast, which sometimes burnt with messages of warning, and yet more often glowed into promises of hope and love.

In hours of careless prosperity we may listen but lightly to the words of Holy Writ, but how often in darker days do they gleam out upon us with transcendent brightness! Once in the Indian mutiny a little party of English fugitives—a young baronet, a young officer, two ladies, and some little children—were trying to escape from their foes. Ragged, ill, starving, with matted hair, their lives in their hands, surrounded by savage enemies, amidst sufferings unspeakable, to which most of them succumbed, their one comfort came from a single scrap of printed paper wrapped about some native medicine which had been brought to them. It happened to be a leaf of the Book of the Prophet Isaiah, and this was the message which came to these poor sufferers from heathen hands. The words they read on that scrap of paper were: "I, even I, am He that comforteth you; who art thou, that thou shouldest be afraid of a man that shall die, and of the son of man, which shall be made as grass; and hast feared continually every day because of the fury of the oppressor? And where is the fury of the oppressor? The captive exile hasteneth that he may be loosed, and that he should not die in the pit, nor that"——; and there the paper was torn off, and they could read no more; but the one thing that sustained them, the one thing that enabled them to struggle through the rest of those terrible sufferings, were these few words on that fragment of paper. Again: Not long ago, in the Atlantic, a passenger ship caught fire. Perhaps there is no more awful moment, no scene more wildly heart-rending, than that which occurs when there seems no choice save of death in the scorching flame or in the heaving waters; but instantly, without a tremor in his accents, without a pause in his swift, masterful decision, the voice of the captain rang across the tumult, inspiring into the crew a manly decision and a manly discipline, and into the terrified passengers confidence and hope. The heroic soul of that one man so prevailed over the terror and the tumult that he brought the ship to haven without the loss of a single life, though the ship became little better than a charred house; and when he was asked whence he derived that sovereign calm in the hour of peril, he replied in these words: "The night before the disaster I had been reading the Bible in my cabin, and I came upon these words: 'When thou passest through the waters I will be with thee; when thou walkest through the fire thou shalt not be burned; neither shall the flame kindle upon thee. For I am the Lord Thy God, the Holy One of Israel, thy Saviour.' Those words," he said, "flashed strongly into my memory when the cry of 'Fire!' arose, and I did not feel one single throb of terror nor one instant loss of hope." Let me take yet one instance more. In the year 1863 there was an earthquake, and the cathedral of Manilla fell upon the clergy and the congregation, but by some peculiarity of structure, if I may quote the words of the Bishop of Derry, "the mass of ruin over the doomed assemblage was for a time kept from crushing down upon them, and while they were thus vaulted over with imminent death, those outside were able to hear what was going on within with no possibility of rendering aid or of preventing the ruin's inevitable fall. A low bass voice, doubtless that of the officiating priest, was heard within uttering these words, 'Blessed are the dead that die in the Lord!' Then deep groans issued from within, as though wrung from the speaker by intense emotion, and the multitude was heard bursting into a passion of tears and sobs. But immediately after the same voice spoke in a calm and even tone, as if addressing those around him, and all heard the words: 'The Lord Himself shall

descend from heaven with a shout, with the voice of the archangel, and with the trump of God, and the dead in Christ shall rise first.'" Ah! my brethren, let us listen to, let us learn, the lessons of Scripture while we may, for these are but one or two of thousands of instances constantly occurring in human life in which our suffering fellow-men have found, and in which we may find, that all other knowledge may be to us but as pearls found in the midst of a scorching desert, but that even the arguments of the word of God will be to us like living waters. In the Old Testament few passages will be more precious than the Psalms of David. In moments of peace and hope which come to us, what words flow more naturally to our lips than "The Lord is my shepherd, I shall not want. He leadeth me into green pastures, He maketh me to lie down beside the still waters?" In our moments of weariness and of anxiety, what truer consolations than "O tarry thou the Lord's leisure; be strong, and He shall comfort thine heart?" In moments of shame and sorrow, what can we better say with bowed heads, and voices broken with sobs, than "Have mercy upon me, O God, according to the multitude of Thy tender mercies. Wash me thoroughly from my wickedness, and cleanse me from my sin?" And all our life long, what simpler prayer can be daily offered up by us than this as the sum total of everything which we desire: "Teach me to do the things that please Thee, for Thou art my God; let Thy loving Spirit lead me into the land of righteousness?"

No wonder, then, that the psalter of Israel is still a part of the Prayer Book of Christendom, for the beauty and pathos and freshness of isolated expressions become yet more precious when we study entire Psalms. How dear, for instance, and how true and how tender is this little short Psalm! It seems to have been called forth by an experience of life, unexpected, indeed, as it is ever unexpected, by our want of faith, yet very far from uncommon. It is the experience that God, after all, does answer the prayers which we offer up in so hopeless and so despairing a spirit. It is the experience that even in the midst of sorrow God is very good to us, far better than we dare to hope.

> Often have been mercies spoken,
> Never is His promise broken,
> Better hath He been for years
> Than our fears.

David had been in anguish, God had most mercifully and graciously delivered him, and therefore he pleads with God for further mercies. And it seems as if that prayer also had been heard in the very utterance, for David adds instantly, "Thou hast put gladness in my heart more than when their corn and wine and oil increased." And so David ends in peace as he had begun, "I will both lay me down in peace and sleep, for it is Thou, Lord, only that maketh me to dwell in safety." Oh, what an exquisite vesper hymn this is! what a world of truth is encircled in its brief compass as to the infinite yearning of man and its sole possible satisfaction! Finding in God more gracious words than we had ever dared to hope, receiving from God more than ever we desired or deserved, have not most of us had the same experience as David?

> I said, "The darkness shall content my soul."
> God says, "Let there be light!"
> I said, "The night shall see me reach my goal
> In that calm dawning bright."
>
> I bared my head to meet the smiter's stroke,
> There came sweet dropping oil.
> I waited trembling, but the voice which spoke
> Said gently, "Ease thy toil."
>
> I looked for evil, stern of face and pale;
> Came good too sweet to tell;
> I leant on God when other joys did fail,
> God gave me these as well.

And so in my text David, with a few spontaneous touches, draws from very life the contrast between God's children and those who, because they will not have their Father in heaven, pass through this life as orphans. The children of the world cry, "Who will show us any good?" God's children have found that He is good. The children of the world love vanity and seek after lies; they cannot, therefore, find the good which they crave. The good they seek is no good. Men please them not, nor women either, and as a consequence they are filled with the fruits of their own ways, which are bitterness, cynicism, and despair. On the other hand, the children of God's love, though by no means secured from trouble and heaviness, yet have peace. There has been a joy, it has been said, even in dungeons and on racks, passing the joy of harvest—a joy strange, solemn, mysterious even to its possessor; a white stone got from the signet ring which the Saviour took from His bosom and bequeathed to those who "endure the cross, despising the shame." It is not to be without conflict, but it is to be undisturbed in the midst of conflict; it is not to be without enemies, but it is to be without the fear of them; it is not to be unpersecuted of slanderous tongues, but it is to be ever able to turn from the storm without to the sunshine of a pure conscience within. That peace which God gives is a peace without pain, because it desires only what is holy; it is a peace without anxiety, because it thinks only what is right; it is a peace without disappointment, because righteousness is a true man's success; it is a peace without terror, because the God of Battles is its friend. Eager for the fray, certain to be heard, desiring only to see God's face, glad, as David says, with a gladness which neither the golden grain can give nor the purple grape, they lie down in peace, sure that they shall rise in safety, because God is with them, and underneath are the everlasting arms: "Thou shalt keep him in perfect peace"; or, as it is in the forcible

simplicity of the original, "Thou shalt keep him in peace, peace, whose mind is stayed on Thee, because he trusteth on Thee." He who has God has all. "Thou hast written well of Me, O Thomas," said Christ in vision to St. Thomas Aquinas; "what reward dost thou desire?" *Non aliam nisi te, Dominie* ("no other reward but Thyself, O Lord.") What a calm reply! "Whom have I in heaven but Thee? and there is none upon earth in comparison with Thee."

There be many who say, "Who will show us any good?" Is it not so? There were many in David's time; there are many now; there always will be many as long as men seek for good in falsity and emptiness, chasing bubbles which burst at every touch, following the meteor lights which only flicker over the fields of death. Chrysostum exclaimed that were he the most eloquent man in the world, and were his pulpit the mountain top, and were the whole world gathered for his congregation, and were his voice loud as the trumpets of archangels, he would preach of no other text than this: "Oh, ye sons of men, how long will ye have such pleasure in vanity, and seek after leasing?" Alas! even such a sermon by such a preacher would for many be in vain. Infinitely greater preachers, of history, of biography, of experience, have preached that lesson in vain; yea, God Himself and the voice of all His prophets. The great hero of modern times, whom we used to see in our youth, the great Duke of Wellington, as one has described him, "like an old eagle of the gods grown silver with service," the "hero of a hundred fights, who never lost an English gun," did he not tell us there is little or nothing in life worth living for, but we can all of us go straight forward and do our duty? He, too, felt like all other splendid conquerors, and like his great rival Napoleon, who said that life was simply hateful to him—he, too, felt the emptiness and disappointment of the highest earthly glory, as it were—the spear of Mantineia in the side of Epaminondas. And were there any need to summon any more of the cloud of witnesses, to burst as with the wand of the magician the tomb's marble slumbers, and to give to its pale phantoms a voice louder than the voice of the dead, would they not dim our glittering delusions by scattering dust and ashes over the pride of life? Did not many of them die, as one has said, "with the whole book of Ecclesiastes written upon their hearts?" Was not "vanity of vanities" their depth of life? Is not this one lesson of all true human experience—

> The world can never give
> The rest for which we sigh;
> 'Tis not the whole of life to live,
> Nor all of death to die.

But let us for a moment glance at the other side. "Who will show us any good?" God will if we seek it. "Thou shalt show me the path of life; in Thy presence there is fulness of joy, and at Thy right hand there are pleasures for evermore." We must not despair of good; it is to be found. It is to be found even in this life. David found it. "Thou has put gladness in my heart," he says, "more than when corn and wine increased. The words are specially remarkable, because probably the third and fourth Psalms were the morning and evening hymn of that most terrible day of his life, on which with his clothes rent and dust upon his head he had walked, weeping, among the weeping people to fly from Absalom the beautiful and bad, the dearest and the most worthless of sons. God's saints, as I have said, are by no means exempt from the common sorrows of humanity. Their happiness must be a happiness like the music of reeds which must first be bruised, and like the myrrh of the plant which must first be crushed, and like the pearl of the shell which must first be wounded. It is a joy, but it is a joy in sorrow, and after sorrow, like those flowers of the twilight, *Flores tristes*, "sad flowers," as the great Swedish botanist called them, which only blossom in the twilight, and whose beauty seems born of darkness and tribulation; yet observe that even in that supreme hour of trial David could still sing as his evening song, "I will lay me down in peace and take my rest, for it is Thou, Lord, only that maketh me dwell in safety."

His rest that night was probably under the starlight and on the hard ground; yet because God was now felt to be near to him, I doubt not that he could sleep far more sweetly than under those gilded roofs, where too often of late he must have seen dark spirits walking in his house: repentant, forgiven, and therefore, whatever happened, safe under the shadow of God's wing, that night David laid him down in peace. The sleep of the forgiven may be as the sleep of the innocent, and that night the sweet oblivion which seals the eyes of the wet sea boy upon the high and giddy mast in the cradle of the rude, imperious surge, came no less to the hunted and weary king. And, just as the

> Sleep that knits up the ravelled sleeve of care

may be ours, even in the deepest sorrow, so peace of mind, peace deep, pure, perfect, unassailable, may be ours as it was David's. Even in the midst of heaviest affliction He who died for us, the Lord Jesus Christ, if we seek Him, will give it us. We may all have seen pictures of the Christian martyr. He is doomed to die that morning a death of horror. Already the roaring of the hungry lions shakes the amphitheatre; already the grey dawn is beginning to steal over the scene, and the doors of the cells which open on the arena are being borne back. But the boy lies sleeping there with a smile upon his face, sleeping calm and happy by his rude, wooden cross, and his face is more calm and more happy than that of the coarse, horror-stricken man who is to be the executioner of his terrible doom. "Shall I stay with you all the

night?" said the brother of Bishop Ridley to him on the morning before his death at the stake. "No, brother," said the good bishop; "I mean to lie down and to sleep as gently as ever I did"; and so the good bishop slept, oblivious of the fiery death which awaited him a few hours thence. These men did not ask, "Who will show us any good?" They had found good. They had "seen the King in His beauty"; He had lifted up "the light of His countenance upon them." God had set them apart for Himself. God had made them to dwell in safety. God gave his beloved sleep.

"Sleep soft, beloved!" we sometimes say;
But have no tune to charm away
Sad dreams that through the eyelids creep;
But never doleful dream again
Shall break the happy slumber when
"He giveth His beloved sleep."

O earth, so full of dreary noises!
O men, with wailing in your voices!
O delved gold, the wailer's heap!
O strife, O curse, that o'er it fall!
God strikes a silence through you all,
And "giveth His beloved sleep."

Are we of the many who have said, and who still say, and will ever say, "Show us any good?" Are we driven to say that our lives "behold darkness and sorrow, and the light is darkened in the heavens thereof?" Ah! then let us pray with David, "Lord, lift Thou up the light of Thy countenance upon us." If we have Him every desire is satisfied. In His light we shall see light, and our hearts, amid whatever trials, will never be hopeless any more, for, as St. Augustine said, and as St. Augustine himself has found after a life of sin, "Thou, O God, has made us for Thyself, and our hearts are restless till they find rest in Thee." If our life be empty, did not our blessed Lord and Saviour, who came from the bosom of the Father to declare and reveal the Father unto us,—did He not put the purpose of His Gospel into one or two sentences when He said, "I am come that ye may have life, and that ye may have it more abundantly?" And when He said to the many broken hearts of men, "Come unto Me, all that are weary and heavy laden, and I will refresh you. Come unto Me. Him that cometh unto Me I will in no-wise cast out. Come unto Me and ye shall find rest unto your souls."

LORD BRASSEY, presiding at the March monthly meeting of the Church of England Sanitary Association, at the Church House, Westminster, said that the Society had been founded because the extent of preventable disease and death in this country, with the consequent appalling amount of sorrow, degeneracy of race, and vast pecuniary loss, constituted a national disgrace; because also the parochial system of the Church afforded an ideal, and, indeed, the only competent organisation for carrying on the work of sanitary reform on an adequate scale.

THE CRY OF IRISH PROTESTANTISM.

BY THE REV. J. A. CARR, LL.D., VICAR AND RURAL DEAN.

SERMON PREACHED IN WHITCHURCH ON SUNDAY MORNING, MARCH 5TH, 1893.

"And he said, hearken ye, all Judah, and ye inhabitants of Jerusalem, and thou king Jehoshaphat, thus saith the Lord unto you, be not afraid nor dismayed by reason of this great multitude; for the battle is not your's, but God's."—2 CHRON. xx. 15.

I DARE say you will not be able in a moment to recall the occasion when these remarkable words were spoken, and therefore I would ask you to allow me to refresh your memories at the present time. The words speak of a great national crisis in the reign of Jehoshaphat, the fourth king of Judah. What kind of a man was this Jehoshaphat, it may be asked? His history, as recorded in this book of the Chronicles of the kings of Judah and Israel, tells us. He was from one point of view a good man. He seems never to have parted with his faith in God, but at the same time he allowed himself to fall terribly under the influence of bad men. For example, he gave way altogether too much to the seductive power of the notorious Ahab, his contemporary on the throne of Israel. We find that he married his eldest son to Athaliah, the daughter of Ahab, a connection which still further bound him to that cruel and impious king. Then when Ahab died Jehoshaphat was ready to make an alliance with Ahab's successor, King Ahaziah, who, we are told by the sacred historian, "did very wickedly," and when Ahaziah died, he joined himself to Joram, who was no better than any of his predecessors.

Now a good man can scarcely compromise himself with such questionable friendships without suffering for it sooner or later, suffering for it not only in spiritual things, but also in material interests. "Evil communications corrupt good manners." The weakly amiable Jehoshaphat, suffered for his amiability. For example, he joined in the ship-building business with Ahaziah, thought perhaps to enlarge his personal wealth besides developing the commerce of his country, but he had no success in his enterprise; ill-fortune attended him. God blew upon his ventures and so punished him for his unholy alliance with the King of Israel. We are distinctly told it was so in the sacred record (thus God's providences at times are revealed to us—the secret cause of His dealing adversely with men). Eliezer, the son of Dodavah of Mareshah, prophesied against Jehoshaphat, saying, "Because thou hast joined thyself with Ahaziah, the Lord hath broken thy works. And the ships were broken that they were not able to go to Tarshish." Thus was his ambitious design of becoming a great ship-owner and a carrying

merchant on the high seas baffled and overthrown, and all because he had joined himself in the enterprise with a bad man and an enemy of God.

Nor was Jehoshaphat more successful in his alliance with Joram, another king of Israel. Joining himself to him they entered on a campaign against Moab. The Moabites, in their exasperation at this hostile invasion of their country, gathered together their kinsmen the Ammonites, and the Syrians, and the Edomites, and formed a powerful and dangerous alliance against the kings of Judah and Israel. They poured their combined forces in one mighty army into Judah, and actually threatened Jerusalem.

Then it was that the better side of Jehoshaphat came out, and it was seen that behind all these unhealthy and foolish and sinful tendencies there was really a deeply pious and reverential element in his character. The tremendous difficulties in which he now found himself compelled the king to fall back upon God for help. He set himself, we are told, to seek the Lord and proclaimed a fast throughout all Judah. All the cities of Judah were stirred, and the people came up as one man to pray before God and to humble themselves in Jerusalem. In the presence of this great gathering of his people, under such terribly trying circumstances with the enemy pouring in on every side, Jehoshaphat offered up the wonderful prayer recited in this chapter. He cried, "O Lord God of our fathers, art Thou not God in heaven, and rulest Thou not over all the kingdoms of the heathen? And in Thy hand is there not power and might so that none is able to withstand Thee? Art not Thou our God Who didst drive out the inhabitants of this land before Thy people Israel and gavest it to the seed of Abraham Thy friend, and they dwell therein and have built Thee a sanctuary therein for Thy Name, saying, When evil cometh upon us as the sword, judgment or pestilence and famine, we stand before this house and in Thy presence (for Thy Name is in this house), and cry unto Thee in our affliction, then Thou wilt hear and help. And now behold the children of Ammon and Moab and Mount Seir, whom Thou wouldst not let Israel invade when they came out of the land of Egypt, but they turned from them and destroyed them not; behold, I say, how they reward us to come to cast us out of Thy possession which Thou hast given us to inherit. O our God wilt Thou not judge them; for we have no might against this great company that cometh against us, neither know we what to do, but our eyes are upon Thee." It was a grand prayer, a prayer full of trust in the power and faithfulness of God, which looked back with gratitude to the past and with hopefulness to the future. It was a unique occasion in the history of the people; it was a terrible crisis in the land, and the inhabitants felt it, for we are told that "all Judah stood before the Lord with their little ones, their wives, and their children." It was a people *in extremis*, but a people in the midst of the tremendous crisis, exercising a child-like and submissive trust in God, believing in His power to save them, and placing their destinies in His hands. Nor did they wait long for an answer to their cry. Scarcely was the king's prayer ended than a strange thing happened. Out of that vast multitude of people, one man stood forth, his voice was heard clear and ringing, while under the power of God's Spirit that fell upon him, he cried aloud, "Be not afraid nor dismayed by reason of this great multitude, for the battle is not yours, but God's . . . . Ye shall not need to fight in this battle; set yourselves, stand ye still, and see the salvation of God."

The words were almost the same as those uttered centuries before in another great crisis in the history of the chosen people, when God was about to overwhelm their enemies in the waters of the Red Sea. And the issue was the same on this memorable occasion. God, to whom the king appealed, the Lord of Hosts, interposed on their behalf, as He had interfered of old in Egypt, and as He afterwards saved them out of the hands of the Assyrians. We know not now how He interposed; we know not the secret of the strange confusions which followed, man setting his weapon against his fellow-man, slaying each other, yea, apparently slaying themselves in a mad frenzy of suicide; but so it was, the great hordes were scattered and annihilated, and when Judah looked forth from their watch-tower, and saw the multitude of their enemies, all they could look upon were "dead bodies fallen to the earth"! No wonder that the previous terror and anxiety and almost desperation of the people were turned at the moment into sentiments of joy and thanksgiving, and that in the fulness of their hearts they returned to Jerusalem "with psalteries, and harps, and trumpets, unto the house of the Lord."

Now, brethren, we are told that "whatsoever things were written aforetime were written for our learning, that we through patience and comfort of the Scriptures might have hope." The great purpose of Scripture is to carry *hope* into the hearts of men, to save them from despondency and despair; and at the present moment, and in the terrible crisis that is now upon us in this island, God knows we sadly want some glimmer of hope. We want some one like this Jahaziel to stand forth in our midst and, like him, cry under the constraining influence of the Spirit of the Lord, "Be not afraid nor dismayed by reason of this great multitude, for the battle is not yours, but God's." What we want to feel, and to know, and to understand above everything else in the present crisis is this, that we are in the hands of God, and that "the Lord reigneth." True, as it was in those days of which this sacred history tells us, we are in a minority in this country, and this is what terrifies us so very much, while we see such a vast multitude of persons arrayed against us, a motley combination like

those Moabites and Ammonites and Edomites who came up against Judah and Jerusalem.

There must be a profound conviction in the hearts of the Protestant minority of Ireland that this Bill to revolutionise the government of the country bodes nothing but evil for them, when we see ourselves thus bound together as one man to protest. Irish Churchmen, our true-hearted and loyal Presbyterian fellow-countrymen, the followers of John Wesley, the community of Friends, the Baptists, have all sunk religious and ecclesiastical differences in one cry of horror at this threatened invasion of their liberties and danger to their lives and properties, and are uniting in common supplication to Almighty God to avert the evil. It is nothing else than a deep sense of coming trouble and disaster, should this Home Rule pass, that thus unites as one man all the Protestant people of Ireland. A noble people, a people with a splendid history in the past, a people who have taken the lead in the civilisation and religious and intellectual advancement of this country, can surely not be thus stirred to their inmost depths without a cause. There is no use disguising the truth. There is a secret feeling of unrest, a nameless terror, that if such a measure were placed on the statute-book, the Roman Catholic majority in this country would before long place their feet on the necks of the Protestant minority. Unfortunately, we know what that Church has proved herself to be in the past, wherever she has obtained the power and the opportunity to assert herself, and we have no reason to believe she would press less heavily upon us here in Ireland. We see at the present moment how heavily she can press upon those of her own flock who dare to be independent and exhibit a mind of their own. It is this feeling above everything else that is now stirring the hearts and minds of Irish Protestants. The enormity of the crime committed in thus plunging an integral part of the United Empire into a vortex of religious animosity, and placing it almost on the verge of civil war, passes human language to express, and the heinousness of the wickedness becomes the more conspicuous when we know that there was no other cause for it than the exigencies of an ambitious and unscrupulous Statesman, who required the vote of his Irish supporters in the House of Commons in order to keep himself in power. But the end is not yet. We believe our cause is God's cause, the cause of truth and righteousness, of civil and religious liberty in Ireland. We do not think that the sun is about to go back on the dial of history after this fashion. The battle is not ours, but God's We place ourselves implicitly in His hands. We this day supplicated His favour and protection, and He is the Divine Being who has said, "Call upon Me in the day of trouble, and I will deliver thee, and thou shalt glorify Me."

"*God is in heaven; it is well with the world.*"

In this crisis, while it is right to be up and doing, to give our money, to hold public meetings, to protest, and to petition, let us likewise not forget the power of prayer, but let us intercede, both in public and in secret, on behalf of our country and her people. For the majority of our countrymen, I firmly believe, need to be saved from themselves, saved from mad enterprises, from foolish and short-sighted imaginations that such a change in the government of Ireland would bring them, as in a moment, peace and prosperity; whereas there is every reason to believe that it is a policy that would carry with it, and that speedily, national disquietude, impoverishment, and ultimate bankruptcy. We may be wrong in all these surmises, we may be only prophets of evil, but if so, we are called upon to meet a very difficult problem—why is it that there is such deep unrest, such universal anxiety, such profound disturbance in the Protestant mind of Ireland to-day? It is not the loss of ascendency we are dreading. It is idle to say this; the Protestants of Ireland have lost any political or ecclesiastical ascendency they ever possessed; but they are trembling for that which is dear to every man—their liberties, their lives, their properties, the future of their children when they themselves have passed away from this scene. They do not relish the prospect of being cut off, as this Bill would cut them off, from full alliance with Protestant England, and their full share in the destinies of a great empire. They do not desire to see their country reduced to the level of a mere colony.

In the presence, then, of the crisis that is upon us to-day, we can but take up the attitude of King Jehosophat, and say: "We have no might against this great company that cometh against us, neither know we what to do, but our eyes are upon Thee." "*Arise, O Lord, help us and deliver us for Thy Name's sake!*"

THE Home Secretary has been asked by Mr. Ernest Hart, on behalf of the British Medical Association, to make an official statement, rendering it clear that the Oaths Act, 1888, empowers witnesses to swear with the right hand uplifted, instead of "kissing the book," which in cases of infectious disease might be dangerous.

SUGGESTIVE HINTS FOR TEACHERS AND WORKERS —The Gospel preached at Antioch, read Acts xi. 19, 30.—1. The Gospel of Christ what we need. 2. The Gospel of Christ our joy. 3. The Gospel of Christ our only hope 4. The Gospel of Christ our way of escape. 5. The Gospel of Christ changes the heart. 6. The Gospel of Christ for all people. 7. The Gospel of Christ must be accepted. 8. The Gospel of Christ seek now.—Lessons: the greatest need of man is the love of our Lord Jesus Christ in the heart. In order to experience this we must accept of His grace His great salvation which He made for us more than eighteen centuries ago. The Gospel of Christ produces the same effects of Christian life and character on all nationalities; its adaptation is thus suited to all

THOMAS HEATH, Plymouth.

NOTICES.

All communications respecting the Literary portion of the paper should be addressed to the Editor.

Business communications of every kind should be addressed to Mr. S. Gibbon, at the Church of England Pulpit Office, 160, Fleet Street, London, E.C., to whom cheques and Post-office orders for subscriptions (in advance), three months, 2s., six months, 3s. 6d., twelve months, 6s. 6d., are to be made payable.

The Cases for binding Vol. XXXIV. are now ready.

For Health and Immortality.

The Ecclesiastical Review.

SATURDAY, MARCH 25, 1893.

CHURCH PATRONAGE.

THE Archbishop of Canterbury means well, but just now the best thing he could have done for the Church would have been to let her alone. All the energies of Churchmen are needed to meet attacks from without; it is not the time to provide brand new stumbling-blocks by calling attention to abuses which exist, after all, rather in theory than practice. To prove the case for the Church Patronage Bill, much, a great deal too much, will have to be made of all abuses that can be cited under the present system. While these will be too few for the purpose, they will be numerous enough for the enemies of the Church to seize upon and point to in triumph as condemnation of the establishment out of its own mouth; and it will not be easy to prevent them from using with effect the weapons thus opportunely supplied.

We do not lay down the principle that evil must always be tolerated rather than that weak points should be exposed. We only maintain that at the present crisis it would have been better to leave unwashed the minute portions of ecclesiastical linen which the Archbishop has set himself to publicly scour. A delay of a few months would have done no harm to anybody. With an unsympathetic Government, the Bill will never pass the Commons; at no distant date the Government will be changed, and his Grace of Canterbury might just as well have waited.

The Archbishop's Bill does not cut at the root of the present system of Church patronage. Our system, or systems, have the immense advantage of variety. There is much to be said in favour of private as well as public patronage. Working side by side, the two save us from any dull level of uniformity of choice and routine promotion. But the Archbishop's Bill is designed to do away with certain evils that undoubtedly have grown up around these systems. The chief of these is rather inaccurately described as simony. Whatever may be the legal definition of simony, the popular idea of it is a fallacy. Simony should mean the offer to purchase spiritual powers and privileges. For instance, if a bishop receives a bribe to ordain a man priest, or a priest, by paying money, gets himself consecrated a bishop, he is clearly guilty of simony. But when a man, being already duly ordained or consecrated, obtains, by payment, an opportunity to exercise the powers and privileges which are already legitimately his, he does not by any means stand in the position of Simon the Sorcerer, who offered to buy from Peter the gift of the Holy Ghost. A good deal of the prejudice attached to the sale of advowsons arises from the fallacy we have now tried to expose.

The Archbishop's Bill very properly does not propose to do away with the sale of advowsons. Advowsons do undoubtedly represent an available asset. It is impossible to believe that the original founders or benefactors of livings did not regard the patronage as something worth having, and worth keeping in their own hands and handing down to their heirs. The value of it may have consisted in sentiment or in local influence; but in any case, in these modern days, it has its equivalent in hard cash, and this is pretty generally recognised. Moreover, it must not be forgotten that the number of advowsons which are bought and sold is comparatively small. The traffic in advowsons is virtually confined to some 700 or 800 benefices.

But, whilst leaving almost unscathed the sale of advowsons, the Archbishop's Bill stringently forbids the sale of "next presentations." Here, indeed, is a distinction without a difference. If it is right to buy the privilege of presenting to a benefice for ever, why is it wrong to buy the privilege of presenting only once? It is quite possible to imagine a great many instances in which the "next presentation" might be of advantage to all parties concerned, whilst the advowson would be of no value whatever. For example, a congregation may want to present a popular and efficient curate, and club together to buy the next presentation; they do not want the advowson, especially as under the Archbishop's Bill it could not be sold again during at least two tenures of the incumbency.

This is a very probable case of real hardship. There is also the case of a patron who, for reasons of his own, does not wish to exercise his own right, but is unwilling to deprive his successors of it. For him what ought to be a valuable asset is rendered worthless. The sale of "next presentations" is in number insignificant. It is the exception for the agents who deal with the sale of Church patronage to have a "next presentation"

on offer, and perhaps not a dozen of these transactions take place in a twelvemonth.

So far then as the traffic in benefices goes, while undoubtedly an abuse crops up here and there and an unfit appointment is made, there is no crying need for immediate legislation, and we are afraid the Archbishop of Canterbury, though with the best intentions, is like the bird that fouls its own nest. Indeed our experience is that scandals in the Church do not as a rule arise from private patronage. The worst appointments of all are invariably made by colleges when livings are, as a rule, taken by the Fellow whose turn comes next, with no regard to fitness or any sort of qualification. The next worse patrons are the bishops. Diocesan exigencies, the desire to provide for estimable incapables, the occasional necessity to make a change in a parish, and a host of other considerations, public and private, constantly operate to trammel and pervert the bishop's choice. None of these things will be improved by the proposed legislation, which is chiefly aimed at preventing the purchase of a presentation in private patronage for any particular individual. To be of any real use it ought to go further. The real evil of Church patronage is the introduction of many considerations other than pecuniary. The wholesale nepotism which practically confines high preferment in the Church to one class and almost to a few families, the absence of any retirement scheme worth the name, the "muddle," there is no other word for it, into which diocesan control is often allowed to slide, the everlasting pushing of well-connected nobodies. Compared with these evils, the occasional abuse of private patronage is of infinitesimal account. The man who has bought himself into a living may not be of the highest spiritual calibre; it is not proven that the son-in-law or nephew, or cousin of the patron is any better, and the man who has invested money in his living is generally well-behaved.

Against other provisions of the Bill there is nothing to be said. We should welcome some wise scheme of parochial control, and it is hard on a parish to have a bankrupt parson. But, on the whole, the Bill cannot be deemed urgent or opportune.

It has been announced in several papers that Mr. Gore, the Principal of Pusey House, has decided to leave Oxford for a while. We believe the statement to be premature, though Oxford residents have probably been long familiar with the rumour. For ourselves we may hope that Mr. Gore will not carry out this supposed idea.

An interesting paper was read last week by the Rev. A. C. Headlam to the Oxford Philological Society. The subject was an early Christian church, probably built about A.D. 450, of which Mr. Headlam discovered the very considerable remains in Asia Minor a year or two ago. The paper will, we understand, be shortly published in the *Journal for Hellenic Studies*.

EVENING COMMUNION.

The Archbishop of York has excited a lively controversy by denouncing *ex cathedra* the practice of Evening Communion. In this, however, he has only followed an example which had been set several years before by the Archbishop of Canterbury, who, in his primary charge, which he published under the title of the Seven Gifts, inserted the following remarkable passage, in which he coupled non communicating attendance with Evening Communion:

> I cannot hold that attending at the Eucharist without receiving it tends to increase reverence. I can place this in no other category than that of Evening Communions. Both tend to familiarity along with diminishing responsibility. Both belong in their origin to weak ages of the Church. The one dates from times when the dreadful habits of half-converted hordes, which accepted the cross as a necessity or as a charm, made sincere priests shrink from urging actual participation amid lives of unredeemed excess. The other belongs to the milder time which is timorous of urging the least touch of discipline, even if it be but the discipline of early rising, and which gives when the day is over that which should have consecrated the Lord's own day and the new week from His resurrection hour. Half the Christian era is against the first indulgence, the whole of it against the second.

It will be seen that, in the above extract, the Archbishop of Canterbury makes two historical statements—(1) that Evening Communion belongs in its origin to a weak, mild, timorous, and undisciplined age of the Church; and (2) that the whole of the Christian era is against it. In order to determine whether these two statements are correct, we have to consider from all the evidence what was the real origin of the practice.

We find then that breaking of bread (κλάσις ἄρτου) accompanied with thanksgiving (εὐχαριστεῖν, εὐλογεῖν) had been one of our Lord's most characteristic actions—so characteristic that, when repeated in the presence of two disciples after the Resurrection, it led to His immediate recognition (Luke xxiv. 31, 35). He is recorded to have performed this action four times. In one of these there is no mention of the time of day (Matt. xv. 36; Mark viii. 6). All the other three took place in the evening.

When He fed the five thousand, it was at an evening hour that He broke bread and gave thanks (Matt. xiv. 15; Mark vi. 35; Luke ix. 12); and this miracle, as the writer of the Fourth Gospel informs us, furnished the occasion for His famous discourse about the Bread of Life, and for His first allusion to the institution which He afterwards founded.

The actual origin of the Lord's Supper was, as every one admits, on His last evening. When the even was come He sat down with the twelve. It seems strange that this should be pronounced by an archbishop to have been a weak, mild, timorous, and undisciplined time, seeing that it was within twenty-four hours of the actual cross.

The next occasion when He broke bread was with the two disciples at Emmaus. Then also it was toward evening and the day was far spent.

Thus, so far as associations of time are concerned, an evening hour carries with it the nearest resemblance to our Lord, and is the exactest imitation of His original institution.

The practice of the Apostles was a repetition of their Master's actions, in respect of time, as of other particulars.

The disciples at Troas (Acts xx. 7) came together in the evening to break bread, and, Paul having con-

tinued his speech to an unusual length, the actual repast was delayed till shortly after midnight.

The Lord's Supper, mentioned in the First Epistle to the Corinthians (1 Cor. xi. 20, etc.), evidently took place at supper-time, and was still, as it had been originally, part of an actual meal.

The very name supper (δεῖπνου), which was the second of the two daily square meals customary in those times, breakfast, *déjeûner* (ἄριστον, Luke xiv. 12; John xxi. 12) being the first, is sufficient in itself to mark it out as an evening meal.

These are the only instances in Apostolic times in which the time of day is specified. at which the bread of Communion was broken, unless we take Paul's breaking of bread on the morning of the shipwreck to have been a Christian Communion (Acts xxvii. 35). This, however, can hardly have been the case, for all the ship's crew and the soldiers partook of that bread, as well as the few Christians who were in Paul's company.

Thus the whole of the primitive evidence is in favour of Evening Communion, proving, beyond the possibility of a doubt, that the origin of that custom was in the age of the Church's first love and youthful strength, and that the Apostolic period of Christian history is decidedly for it. Indeed the only way in which the Archbishop of Canterbury's strange statements can be accounted for is by supposing that his Grace had acquired the habit of regarding the age of our Lord and His Apostles as a period outside of, and previous, to the Christian era. It is a curious blunder for a prelate to make, but *aliquando bonus dormitat Homerus.*

Since the practice of Evening Communion was thus begun by Jesus Christ Himself, and continued by His Apostles, all question as to its lawfulness is at an end, for those who believe that the Christian religion issued perfect and complete from the life and teaching of its Founder, and that it was not left by Him to be developed by the theologians of later ages. Just as no limited numbers, however large or many, when added to or subtracted from infinity, make any difference in the sum, so no number of inferior authorities either increase or diminish the weight of that authority which is supreme and irrefragable. Such authorities, if favourable, are mere surplusage, or, if unfavourable, are only decisions of lower tribunals possessing no weight against a clear judgment of the highest tribunal of all. Therefore the questions why, when, and under what influences the Lord's Supper was changed into the Lord's breakfast, though interesting subjects of antiquarian research, must have no influence on the decision of the point at issue. It is only as a question of ecclesiastical antiquities, and not as an appeal to authority, that we enter into this branch of the subject.

In the Didache, which is the next evidence after the New Testament, the hour of Communion is not named; but the breaking of bread was still part of a meal, in which communicants partook to the satisfaction of hunger and thirst (μετὰ τὸ ἐμπλησθῆναι, Didache 10. Compare John vi. 12, ὡς ἐνεπλήσθησαν); and prayer, exhortation. thanksgiving, and communion were all parts of one single meeting.

The first sign of a division of the one meeting is found in the next witness, who is Pliny (about 112 A.D.) He relates that the Christians of his province of Bithynia deposed in evidence before him that their practice was to hold two meetings on their fixed day of worship. At the first of these they assembled before dawn, sang a hymn (*carmen*) to Christ as God, and bound themselves with an oath (*sacramento*) to abstain from all crime and sin. The second meeting was after an interval of time, the length of which is not specified, and was for the purpose of taking food together (*ad sumendum cibum*). The question here arises, Which of these two meetings was the actual Lord's Supper? The word *sacramentum* strikes us from its associations with our own practice, and naturally leads some to think that this was what is called, in modern phrase, "an early celebration." We must, however, examine this word, which has occupied so large a space in Christian theology and ritual, and which occurs here for the first time in connection with Christianity —strangely enough from the pen of a Pagan. The word is Latin, and there were yet no Latin churches, even in Rome itself, much less in the heart of the Greek country which formed Pliny's province. It therefore can only be a translation by Pliny himself, or by the witnesses whom he examined, of some Greek word which was actually used in the Bithynian congregations. This word could hardly have been μυστήριον, which came afterwards to be treated as the equivalent of *sacramentum*, for Pliny evidently understood it as an oath or pledge, which μυστήριον does not mean. We cannot identify the word. The only point that is quite clear is, that in the Bithynian congregations which fell under Pliny's notice, the one Christian meeting had already been divided into two, the *carmen* and *sacramentum* taking place at daybreak, and the common meal at a later hour. But which of these two was the Lord's Supper? It is to be feared that each person will answer this question according to his own prejudices, for a decided answer is not possible on any firmer basis than mere subjective ideas; yet, perhaps, some little light may be thrown on the matter by our next witness.

This division of the one Christian meeting into two parts could not have been general, for about forty years later (A.D. 150), the Christian meeting which Justin Martyr describes (*Apol.* i. 65, 66) is only one, containing in itself all the particulars of Christian worship—Scripture reading, exhortation, prayers, thanksgivings, offerings, and communion. The bread, wine, and water distributed in the last-named rite are spoken of as τρόφη, which is the equivalent of the Latin *cibus*, an expression which rather leads us to surmise, though not to conclude with certainty, that the second of the two meetings, described by Pliny's witnesses, was the actual Communion. Justin, we may add, gives no indication of the hour of meeting.

When, however, we enquire from Justin whether at any Christian meeting a *sacramentum* or oath was actually administered, we find that such a solemn promise was made at baptism (Just., *Apol.* 61)—a fact which might lead us to suppose that the earlier meeting mentioned by Pliny had for one of its chief purposes the baptism of adult converts, while the second was for the Lord's Supper (*cibus*, τρόφη), which, as we learn from the Didache, was entirely a service of thanksgiving.

About fifty years later (A.D. 200), Tertullian (*Apol.* 39) gives us a graphic, though, after his manner, turgid description of the Christian meeting as it existed in his times. It was still only one, containing all the same particulars as in the earlier accounts, and it was in the evening, for at a certain period of it lights were introduced, which could not have been for ceremonial purposes, for this writer repeatedly ridicules the use of lights by daylight, then common in Pagan

temples, but not yet adopted in Christian Churches (*Apol.* 35, 46).

Thus the practice of Evening Communion was not yet abandoned at the end of the second century; the Lord's Supper and the *Agape* were still identical, or at least combined, as they had been at the beginning; and both were parts of one evening meal.

The time of the change must be referred to the third century. It must have been gradual, brought about by free imitation or the influence of distinguished men, for until the time of Cyprian (A.D. 250), at the earliest, the union of Christian Churches was one of mutual sympathy only, and there was as yet no attempt at forming a corporate organisation of the whole church; nor was there any central or even provincial authority sufficiently established to be able to direct or enforce a change.

It is natural to suppose that the cause of the change was the occurrence of abuses, like those which prevailed at Corinth, and of which many examples may be cited from later times. These evils would obviously tend to increase as the religion became more widely spread, and merely external adherents more numerous. But, in the absence of definite information, it is best to abstain from conjectures, which can be little more than subjective guesses, whether we be *idiotæ* or archbishops. The facts which remain historically certain are, that our Lord's own breaking of bread took place in the evening; that in the primitive Apostolic age it continued to take place in the evening in connection with an actual supper, and that the same usage prevailed to the end of the second century.

Although our Lord's own practice was thus Evening Communion, it cannot be supposed that He intended His parting institution to be limited to the evening hour. Fixed hours and days were no part of the Gospel which He preached, or of the institutions which He founded. Even the observance of the Sabbath, venerable and sacred as it was, must, according to His teaching, be subject to modification in accordance with the needs, bodily and spiritual, of mankind. On all such points He left us perfectly free. Thus not only the evening supper, which He Himself and His Apostles practised, but the morning breakfast, which took its place in the Church's third age, are acceptable to Him, if celebrated in spirit and in truth, if found by experience to edify man and to tend to holiness and charity.

Thus the real question to be considered is whether Evening Communion is edifying. Experience teaches us that there are certain classes to whom it is the most edifying time. One of these is that of married women of the labouring class. For these Sunday is a very full and busy day. To go to church at an early hour would be for them a neglect of duty. The children have to be got out of bed, washed, and dressed, supplied with breakfast, and sent to Sunday-school. Then the Sunday dinner—often the only regular family meal of the whole week at which the father is present, and which has a right to rank as a domestic *agape*—must be prepared and served. It is late in the afternoon before the wife and mother has any time to call her own. Very often it is only after the little ones have been put to bed that an hour of quiet comes at last, when she may think of her own soul, and come to the table of her Lord.

There are also a number of occupations, such as the railway service, the police, gasworks, printing offices, and a great many branches of manufacture, in which men are employed at abnormal hours, so that for them evening is often the morning of the working day. When actual life is thus so variously arranged with respect to the hours of occupation, is it wise, and is it charitable, to set up a hard and fast rule, that no bread of communion shall be broken after twelve o'clock at noon, and this in deference to a mere tradition of the elders, which is distinctly at variance with the practice of Christ Himself?

Ecclesiastical dignitaries need to learn that our Lord's own example overrides all the decisions of that historic episcopate of which they are so proud to think themselves members, and also to consider that Holy Communion was made for man, not man for it. It must be adjusted carefully and sympathetically to the needs of actual life. If they would humble themselves to learn of their Master, and to observe the necessities of man, they would not condemn the guiltless, nor forbid what God has not forbidden, nor infringe the liberty which is the inheritance of all Christians. Nor can they safely forget that, in those who witness their condemnation of an undoubted practice of Jesus Christ and His Apostles, dubious thoughts may arise as to the origin and benefits of archiepiscopal authority.

If we cast one backward glance over this whole controversy, we may see very clearly that the point above discussed is only one particular in the great fundamental question that is at issue between the original Christianity, which Jesus left behind, and that which has been since His time framed or developed by the priests and theologians of later ages. Prelates naturally take their stand upon the latter—the Christianity of tradition. We have ventured, even against their high authority, to express our adherence to the former—the Christianity of Christ. It remains for all earnest and truthful minds to choose between these two alternatives.

One other observation we should also wish to make with regard to that party or school of thought, which finds itself menaced by this and other recent archiepiscopal decisions. Let those who desire to adhere or return to primitive Christianity encourage themselves by the remembrance that nothing revives or purifies a drooping and degenerate religious body more surely than a prelate's ban. It was under the solemn condemnation of a hierarchy, which the first Christians admitted to be of divine appointment, that our religion first struggled into life; it was in opposition to another hierarchy, whose claims none at first questioned, that, at the Reformation, freedom of religious thought was won. If the evangelical body have courage and disinterestedness, history will repeat itself for a third time. Their decline may be traced to the period when they enjoyed securely the popular favour, and, under the influence of Lord Shaftesbury, received a very large part of the episcopal appointments. Through this prosperity an immense accumulation of chaff has covered their sound and good corn. The thing that is needed to blow this chaff away is a course of that mild form of persecution which alone is possible in our time. Suppose them to be, as is dimly threatened, excluded from that preferment and those positions which are their due, what will be the result? They will be deserted by those numerous time-servers who have not the courage of their opinions, but are ready to adopt any attitude, to preach any doctrine, and to acquiesce in any idolatry, that may be fashionable, lest they stop their advancement and blight their career; while those who remain will find their own moral fibre strengthened, and the respect

in which the people hold them greatly increased. Thus while they continue within the English Church, established or disestablished, their witness will have no uncertain sound; and if the revolution in that Church, which is now in progress, proceeds so far as to render their position untenable, they will have courage to go forth, as so many of the Scottish clergy did at the period of the disruption, sacrificing their positions to their convictions. At present they are not morally equal to either of these efforts, but a few condemnations may be the very discipline needed to restore to them the missing strength.

CORRESPONDENCE.

To the Editor of the CHURCH OF ENGLAND PULPIT AND ECCLESIASTICAL REVIEW.

THE RELIGIOUS QUESTION BEFORE THE LONDON SCHOOL BOARD.

SIR,—I have received letters urging me to comply with the following resolution, which emanates, I understand, from the E.C.U., and has been adopted at meetings of Churchmen held in the Marylebone Division:—

"That this meeting tenders its hearty thanks to Mr. A. Riley and to the Rev. J. Coxhead, Mr. F. Davies, and others, who have so heartily supported him in the stand he has taken in regard to religious instruction in board schools, and earnestly presses upon the members of the School Board for this division the importance of supporting the amendment put down in the names of Mr. A. Riley and Mr. Sharp, so as to define clearly what is meant by the word 'Christian,' as qualifying the religious instruction given in these schools."

Will you find room for my reply, in which I have endeavoured to point out the very unsatisfactory character of the amendment we are asked to support?—

"Dear Sir,—I regret that it is impossible for me to support Mr. A. Riley's amendment.

"My reason for refusing to do so is, that so far from agreeing with the terms of the resolution forwarded to me, which states that the amendment *defines clearly* what is meant by the word 'Christian,' I consider the so-called definition most insufficient. I am indeed surprised that any meeting of Churchmen should have given their unqualified assent to it.

"Even Mr. Coxhead, who is mentioned in the resolution as a hearty supporter of Mr. Riley's policy, is careful to warn the readers of the *Guardian*, in his letter last week, against the elimination of the doctrines of the Atonement and the Trinity from the Christian religion, and so unwittingly emphasises the grave fault I have to find with the amendment. A definition of Christianity which mentions only the Incarnation is, in my opinion, miserably imperfect and out of harmony with the creeds of the Church."

C. J. RIDGEWAY.

36, Porchester-terrace, W.

UNITED ACTION.

SIR,—I fancy Churchmen of all shades of opinion must have welcomed the timely utterances of the Archbishop of Canterbury on *united action* in opposing the Welsh Suspensory or Hanging Bill; and I hope none of my brethren will call opposing meetings by an inflammatory placard, such as I see in the *Bristol Mercury* of this week. Next to the advice of the Archbishop to oppose by petitions to Parliament this cruel measure, ranks the earnest hope of his Grace and other Bishops that the opposition raised should be entirely non-political. The question is one of simple justice or injustice. Mr. Chamberlain is in favour of Disestablishment, but he opposes this *Hanging* Bill.

The Bishops of England are not carrying out the recommendation of the Archbishops and Bishops in Convocation to promote Unionism. There will be no mistake about the public feeling of Churchmen, if our Bishops do not immediately follow their lead and come forward as our leaders. I speak from what I have heard laymen say, as to the absence of Unionism.

In this diocese we clergy get a notice about "considering the Welsh Suspensory Bill." If the notice had added, "and how far the Eighth Commandment is obligatory in the nineteenth century," it would have completed it. And this debate is relegated to some three weeks hence! I cannot help mentioning this absurdity and delay. It is more than common patience can stand quietly, when the question is, not only opposing terrible injustice, but depriving one portion of our kingdom of ministration of clergy who are confessedly only doing their duty too well for the political Dissenters, who think they can eventually carry out Mr. Philanthropic Gee's scheme as to tithes and churches.

Where meetings are called, the notice should state the definite object, and that those are asked to meet who wish to enter their protest against the Welsh Suspensory Bill, and it should be clearly stated that it is *non-political*. A. D. PRINGLE.

Blakeney, March 22nd, 1893.

TRAINING FOR COOKERY TEACHERS.

SIR,—I should be much obliged if you would permit me to make known through your columns that the committee of the National Society have decided to devote a portion of the income derived from the "Berridge Trust" towards establishing and maintaining a school to train well-educated women for the work of teaching cookery in elementary schools. His Grace the Archbishop of Canterbury has kindly placed a most convenient building in the Lambeth Palace grounds at their disposal, and the Education Department have promised to recognise the diplomas which the National Society propose to grant.

The school will be opened on Monday, April 10th. One of the special objects of the school will be to provide competent cookery teachers for rural districts, and I have every assurance from competent authorities that ladies who obtain the Society's diploma will have no difficulty in finding work in our schools as cookery teachers. I shall be glad on application to forward papers containing full information.

J. S. BROWNRIGG, Secretary.

National Society's Office,
Sanctuary, Westminster, S.W.,
March 20th, 1893.

THE Dean of Wells has become a Vice-President of the Church Missionary Society.

PREFERMENTS AND APPOINTMENTS.

Allnutt, Rev. P. R.; Rector of Ravensden, Beds.
Baker, Rev. E. G., B.A., B.Sc., Head Master of Nantwich Grammar School; Licensed to Officiate in the Diocese of Chester.
Blakeston, Rev. L. H., M.A.; Vicar of All Saints, Rotherhithe.
Brown, Rev. M. T., Vicar of St. Barnabas's, New Humberstone, Leicester; Vicar of St. Matthew's, Leicester.
Brown-Constable, Rev. A. E., late Vicar of Appleby, Lincoln; Chaplain at Sholapur, India.
Brunskill, Rev. John Ritson, M.A., Assistant-Master of Portwood, Stockport; Curate-in-Charge of St. Peter's, Bowdon, Cheshire.
Carlyon, Rev. Thomas Trist, M.A.; Licensed Preacher in the Diocese of Canterbury.
Carter, Rev. A. R., D.D.; Lecturer at St. John's, Wapping.
Compton, Rev. William Cooksworthy, M.A.; Licensed Preacher in the Diocese of Canterbury.
Edgeworth, Rev. L. C. A., Curate of Wolstanton, Stoke-on-Trent; Curate of Hawarden, with charge of one of the District Mission Churches in that Parish.
Eppstein, Rev. William Charles, M.A.; Licensed Preacher in the Diocese of Canterbury.
Harrison, Rev. D. P., M.A.; Vicar of Ixworth, Suffolk.
Hennell, Rev. Harold Barclay, Rector of Tintern; Vicar of Chapel-hill, Monmouth.
Jenkins, Rev. C. M.; Chaplain of Darenth Asylum and Schools.
Lanchester, Rev. Charles Preston, M.A.; Rector of Tivetshall St. Margaret-with-St. Mary, Norfolk,
Longsdon, Rev. William Hook, M.A., Curate of St. Lawrence's, Catford; Vicar of St. Michael's, Southwark.
M'Kinney, Rev. James, M.A.; Vicar of St. Silas's, Pembroke-place, Liverpool.
Matthews, Rev. Joseph, late Rector of Chesham Bois; Perpetual Curate of St. Mary's, Hatfield, Herts.
Percival, Rev. H. C., Senior Chaplain of St. Mary's Cathedral, Edinburgh; Vicar of St. Peter's, Southampton.
Ramsay, Rev. A. K.; Assistant Chaplain of Holloway (with Newgate) Prison.
Scott, Rev. J. H., M.A., Rector of Spitalfields; Honorary Diocesan Organising Secretary of the Church Army for East London.
Smith, Rev. Clement, M.A.; Vicar of St. Nicholas-in-the-Castle, Isle of Wight.
Spooner, Rev. Henry Maxwell, M.A., Vicar of Holy Trinity, Maidstone; Vicar of Saltwood, Hythe.
Watson, Rev. Christopher Stowell, M.A.; Licensed Preacher in the Diocese of Canterbury.
Winter, Rev. Ernest, Senior Curate of Halifax; Rector of St. Mary's, Elland, Yorkshire.
Wright, Rev. George Farncomb, M.A., Rector of Lambourne; Rector of St. Mary Abchurch, London.

CLERICAL OBITUARY.

Bamber, Rev. William Richard, M.A., LL.B., of St. Clement's City-road, E.C., and formerly of St. Peter's, Folkestone, at Folkestone, on the 18th inst., aged 37.

Caddell, Rev. Henry, M.A., for thirty-nine years Vicar of St. Peter's, at St. Peter's Vicarage, Colchester, on the 15th inst., aged 81.

Gabb, Rev. James Frederick Secretan, formerly Vicar of the parish, at Charlton Kings, Cheltenham, on the 12th inst., aged 83.

Galliers, Rev. T., for fourteen years Rector of Kirstead, at Kirstead Rectory, Norwich, on the 10th inst.

Manners, Rev. John, M.A., at Claremont, Brockley, on the 10th inst., aged 86.

Prevost, Ven. Sir George, Bart., late Archdeacon of Gloucester, and for fifty-nine years Incumbent of Stinchcombe, at Stinchcombe, on the 18th inst., in his 89th year.

Seymour, Rev. William, late Vicar of Watford, Northamptonshire, at 5, Richmond-gardens, Bournemouth, on the 18th inst.

FIRST REMOVE THE CAUSE.

MEN frequently worry and trouble themselves a great deal in trying to cure the symptoms of vital weakness nervous exhaustion, and kindred ailments, instead of endeavouring to first remove the cause. This can be done by Mr. Harness' Electropathic Treatment without the aid of drugs. It is useless to tell sufferers to employ their minds and bodies in useful work and to forget their disorders, so long as the cause of their troubles is not removed. How can it be expected that when they are fatigued by the least exertion they can occupy themselves by studying, walking, or other exercise? Even in conversation they frequently lose the thread of it and repeatedly find their memory failing them. What can they do? Physic will not cure them—perhaps the leading physicians have fallen to afford them any relief, and they have consequently become hopeless. It is to such as these that Mr. Harness' new combined Electropathic Belt and Suspensory is so strongly recommended, as, by its gentle but continuous action, invigorating electric currents are imperceptibly generated and conveyed direct from the spinal cord to the affected parts. It is this scientifically constructed and convenient appliance which silently but surely acts upon the vital organs, and removes the cause of the patient's disease, effecting a wonderful change in his health, character, and conduct, and speedily enabling him to return to his natural tastes and habits, and enjoy once more the full vigour of youth, with all its accompanying pleasures.

We may add that this perfect Electro-medical appliance is exceedingly comfortable to wear, gives wonderful support and vitality to all the internal organs of the body, prevents chills, imparts new life and vigour to the debilitated constitution, stimulates the organic action, promotes the circulation, assists digestion, and promptly renews that vital energy, the loss of which is the first symptom of decay. Its healing properties are multifarious. It stimulates the functions of various organs, increases their secretions, gives tone to muscle and nerves, relaxes morbid contractions, improves nutrition, and effectually renews exhausted nerve force. Acting directly on the system it sustains and assists its various functions, and thus promotes the health and vigour of the entire frame. Besides these benefits, the mind is maintained in a buoyant, cheerful state, and every faculty is stimulated to the highest condition of intellectual strength.

Gentlemen who read the above announcement have only to visit London and call at the Electropathic and Zander Institute (52, Oxford Street, W.) to be convinced of the marvellous curative powers of Electricity and Mr. Harness' perfect methods of imperceptibly applying the current. The medical officers of the establishment are in daily attendance, and may by consulted free of charge either personally or by letter.

The Church of England Pulpit.

THE TEMPTATION OF JESUS.

By the Rev. CANON DUCKWORTH, D.D.

Sermon Preached in Westminster Abbey on Sunday, February 19th, 1893.

"Then was Jesus led up of the Spirit into the wilderness to be tempted of the devil."—Matt. iv. 1.

WITH the return of Lent, brethren, we are brought once more face to face with that wonderful experience in the life of our Lord—that mysterious interlude between His baptism and His ministry which is called His fasting and temptation. The Gospel for to-day gives us the narrative of it; the Collect, though it does not directly refer to the temptation, tells of the fast of forty days and forty nights which preceded it, and points the lesson of that long abstinence—a lesson endorsed by the experience of countleess saints of God whence the Divine Master's great victory was won—namely, that the self-denial of our lower nature is the sure means of reinforcing the higher, and so of preparing us to meet the assaults of the tempter. All through those solemn weeks which now lie before us, this is the subject which the Church invites us to study—our Lord's great conflict with the spirit of evil; and, therefore, it may be well to ask ourselves at the outset what the nature of that conflict was, and in what respects it can be made helpful to us in our continual and precarious struggle with His enemy and ours.

There is one conviction which must be present to us all—namely, that if the fact of His temptation is to be a source of strength and consolation to us in our hours of trial, we must believe in its reality, we must assure ourselves that He was tempted, not in some peculiar, transcendental, exceptional way, quite remote in our human experience, but "like as we are."

It has been held by more than one profound critic of the Gospels that in the account of the Temptation we have a condensed and highly figurative narrative, originally given by our Lord Himself, of solicitations offered to Him at the outset of His ministry by human agents, men who approached Him full of worldly and political hopes, eager to make Him the instrument of their designs. They came to Him, it is suggested, with His earliest consciousness of Messiahship, when the wonderful apparitions and voice from heaven which signalised His baptism had marked Him out as a Being with a beginning and destiny very different from those of the penitents who flocked to the forerunner. They came to Him to divert Him, if possible, from that path of suffering and humiliation which was the appointed way to sovereignty over the heart of man. They endeavoured to persuade Him that His true glory was to make His kingdom a kingdom of this world. They appealed to Him to use His superhuman power at His own discretion, and to clear a short and easy passage to the throne. Certainly it is in favour of this view that at a later day, when the foremost of His own disciples attempted to shake His firm resolve to go forth to the cross and passion, He turned upon him at once as though the spirit of evil had become incarnate in the speaker, as though in that suggestion that escaped from the lips of St. Peter He recognised the unhallowed voice of the tempter: "Get thee behind Me, Satan; thou art an offence unto Me; for thou savourest not the things that be of God, but those that be of men."

Perhaps no view of the mode in which our blessed Lord was tempted appears to solve so many difficulties of the Gospel narrative as this; for can we not imagine that the sacred writers were inspired thus to give us in brief and vivid outline the substance of those various successive attempts made under the instigation of Satan to turn our Lord from the great work which the Father had given Him to do? I know that many persons are deeply perplexed by the literal story of temptation; they endeavour in vain to realise it and to reconcile it with their conception of our Lord's nature. As for the transaction itself as it stands narrated, not a few of us, I suppose, carry into after days the impressions made upon our youthful imagination by the pictures employed to illustrate it. All our lives we are more or less at the mercy of a literal and realistic and religious art. Religious poets like Milton, religious painters like Ary Scheffer, have to answer for a great deal of the literalism or materialism which infects our conceptions of the more mysterious parts of Divine revelation. In a work of surpassing power the artist I have named has familiarised us with an actual personal encounter between Jesus Christ and the arch-tempter. On the summit of a high mountain stand two figures—the one Divinely human, with a face of intense spirituality, heightened by the traces it bears of the forty days' fast; and beside him, in strongest contrast, is a dark, enearthly form, the very incarnation of godless intellect, whose eyes glow with the very fires of hell, and whose outstretched hands seem to quiver with the fierce earnestness with which he calls upon the Son of God to fall down and worship him. In that fine picture the artist has fixed the idea which the story of the temptation suggests to most minds, for most of us have been wont to think of Satan as approaching our Lord in some strange physical form, and addressing him in audible, if not human, voice, requiring Him to

change stones into bread ; then spiriting Him away from the wilderness to the Temple, and bidding Him fling Himself from the dizzy height of its pinnacle into the valley below ; then finally transporting Him to some lofty peak, beneath which all the kingdoms of this world and the glory of them lay outstretched, and offering Him these as His reward if only He will fall down and do homage to the usurper, who claims to have the disposal of them. However crude and faulty this conception of the temptation may be, at least it serves to impress upon us what is so emphatically taught within the Bible—I mean the personality of the spirit of evil in the universe. We find here from the first a clear and powerful background of evil depicted—a kingdom of evil spirits or demons with a prince or ruler at their head, who bears various names: the "Devil,' the "Tempter," "Satan," "Beelzebub," the "Prince of Devils," the "Strong One," the "Wicked One," the Enemy," or the "Hostile One." In to-day's Gospel you find the first three of these names all used. We are given clearly to understand that our Lord's temptation consisted not in the mere presentation of presumptuous and unholy thoughts, but in the encounter with an adversary who is the living representative of the kingdom of darkness. It is impossible to read the story of His conflict in the light of His miracles and His teaching without seeing that evil is set forth by Him as the action of a living will soliciting us from outside, a living will presiding over a kingdom hostile to the Divine, and hostile to man as the offspring of the Divine.

And now let us try, in all reverence, to understand what constituted the temptation of our Lord by this evil power. In our own case we well know what is necessary to constitute a temptation. There must be, first, a strong natural desire to yield to the suggestion of evil, and there must be also the conviction that it is wrong to yield to it. We cannot be said to be tempted unless we are conscious of a dreaded inclination to do what we feel to be wrong. The man, for example, to whom strict sobriety is second nature feels no temptation to excess. You may ply him with every incentive to indulgence, but it makes no appeal to unlawful desires ; his appetite is so completely under control that he is unmoved by your offers, and conscious of no struggle. It costs him no effort whatever to keep within the bounds of strict temperance. But let craving exist, let appetite be clamouring or ready to clamour within, let the lower nature be bent upon outvoting the higher, and then opportunity brings on the crisis ; the sight or suggestion of means to do the wrong deed sets up that sore tumult within which we call temptation, the struggle between the powers of good and evil for the mastery. Now is it not most difficult for us to understand how our blessed Lord's temptations can have been real to Him unless it was possible for Him to be affected by them? In their fear of imputing to Him the faintest leaning towards disobedience, the faintest liability to compliance with evil, men have deprived His trial of all meaning, for it has been said that the only pain of which He could have been conscious while passing through it was a pain which a perfectly holy being could not but feel when in contact with the perfectly sinful one. He suffered, being tempted, it is said, but only because of the foulness of the sinful atmosphere around him, only because of the loathsome proximity to an utterly corrupt and rebellious nature. But if the suggestions of evil were addressed to one on whom they could not possibly take effect, whose will, indeed, they could not even reach, what shall we learn from our Lord's treatment of them? In all reverence we ask ourselves, What good can have been served by exposure to the assaults of the Tempter if, after all, there was no battle fought and no victory won? If the encounter described was only an empty passage of arms, a mere fencing-match with blunted foils, only the semblance of a struggle in which no strength was put forth and no risk run, what lesson can it convey to us?

When you and the brethren are tempted, as we are tempted day by day, to do what we ought to leave undone and to leave undone what we ought to have done, can it help us to bear in mind that the Son of God, our example, was tempted only in name, not in reality ; that He passed through an experience totally unlike ours of the kind, inasmuch as He was incapable of swerving even in thought from that perfect obedience to the Divine will? We do not require to be told that we are here on ground where it behoves us to tread with the utmost caution and humility, for we touch upon the mysterious union of the Divine and the human natures in Christ. But quite certain it is that no conception of Him can be correct which deprives His example of power to guide and sustain us ; and if we come to regard any part of His work for us as unreal, we shake our faith in the whole. Surely in those hours above all when we most need it, in those incessant conflicts in which we look for grace to foil the tempter's power, we are helpless indeed unless we can feel that He is one with us in sympathy, because, in a true, intelligible sense, He has been one with us in experience. Yes, surely He was "tempted like as we are." A great theologian, at whose feet many of this generation have sat, has said, indeed, that "if the incarnate Christ could have erred or sinned, the Incarnation, we may dare to say, would have been a phantom." But, brethren, to represent our blessed Lord as not only having the power to resist temptation, but as not possibly having the smallest desire to yield to it, or even the capability of doing so, is equivalent to saying that He never was tempted at all What, it seems to me, we are clearly intended to understand is this: that an appeal was made directly to

the human will of Christ to set itself in opposition to the Divine will; that He was actually solicited to accomplish a great object by other means than those which He knew to have been ordained and appointed by God; and, more than this, that our Lord felt the full strength of the temptation before He put it from Him. If the human will of Christ had not been capable of asserting itself independently of the Divine will, how shall we interpret that prayer uttered by him in Gethsemane: "Father, if Thou be willing, remove this cup from Me; nevertheless, not My will, but Thine, be done"; or those words in which He set forth the purpose and spirit of His mission: "I came down from heaven not to do Mine own will, but the will of Him that sent Me"? Let us beware of those glosses upon the temptation which, under the profession of honouring Christ, would empty it of all reality and all profit. We must not so state the doctrine of His sinlessness as to reduce His great trial to a phantom and a nullity. The temptation He underwent was real, severe, searching; it was resisted not by His Godhead, but by His manhood—resisted not by insensibility, not by impassivity, not by what theologians sometimes call "impeccability," but by the exercise of that very faith to which He calls us and with which He offers to inspire us. Therefore it is that we ourselves may appeal to it, even now as we approach His throne in heaven and say, "By Thy temptation, Good Lord, deliver us."

And let us bear in mind in regard to temptation, that the desire to which it is addressed may be a desire which in itself is perfectly innocent and righteous. It was so in the case of Jesus, in whose soul no other kind of desire could dwell; and the wrong would in that case consist, not simply in the gratification of the desire, but in the mode of its gratification, in its being at variance with God's appointed order. Thus, I think, we can approach to some understanding of the fact that He could be sinless and yet could be capable of temptation Sin, meaning by sin not the perception of evil, but the participation in it, is no essential part of the original nature which came pure from the hand of its Creator; it is the attribute of the fallen, but not necessarily of human nature, and our Lord had no need of its experience. He did not require to commit sin in order to become one of us and to understand what we have to go through. The desire which He cherished, and was invited to gratify, was not sinful in itself; it was one which he had the fullest right to entertain—nay, a desire of which we know he shall one day see the perfect realisation and fulfilment. All the kingdom of the world and the glory of them are one day to be His, for "He must reign until He has put all things under His feet." It was for the crown of that universal empire that He lived and died; the thought of it was "the joy set before Him,' in the strength of which He "endured the cross, despising the shame, and is set down at the right hand of God."

So, then, what shall we learn from our Master's dark experience? Can we not see that His trial consisted in the invitation to forfeit a great ideal, to fall short of a glorious destiny, to take up with a dazzling carnal glory instead of winning His way through God-appointed sufferings to eternal renown? He was shown how He might turn out of the steep and stony path of sacrifice into the smooth and easy road of earthly pomp and grandeur; how He might conquer the world with the world's own weapons, and all should be His. And, I ask, have we not all our ideals? Is it not in us to rise to something which we are not yet; to fill our place in this world, however small and obscure it be, in a higher and worthier way than we have yet attained to? Temptation will change its form as men ascend in the moral scale; it never ceases for any one of us, and the temptation which most nearly approaches that of our blessed Lord is that to which the nobler spirits among men are most exposed. I mean the temptation to surrender a lofty ideal, to flinch from high service, to cease to care either to struggle or to aspire. Ah! how many and how subtle are the wiles by which the tempter persuades a man who has set his heart on some great and arduous plan of life, not to wait and "see of the travail of his soul," since all sacrifice and all aspiration are vanity? Those to whom much is given, those who have it in them to fulfil a high destiny and to bless the world, are those to whom our Lord's victory may come home in all its reassuring power, bidding them to be invincibly true to their better selves, bidding them trust implicitly the high convictions of their souls. He who would be a saviour of men must "deny himself and take up his cross," if he would win the crown.

But all of us, brethren, whatever our destiny, whatever our power and opportunities, have an interest of the deepest kind in our Lord's struggles and in His victory. When we are told that "He was tempted like as we are," we know that we may all of us, high and low, lettered and simple, gifted and commonplace, we may all look to Him in our endless variety of temptation, we may all learn from His example, we may all be sustained by His grace. For He used no weapon in that great encounter which it is not in the power of His humblest disciple to wield. There was nothing special to His own case, nothing out of our reach in the tactics with which He met the arch enemy. No; we may do what He did. We may meet the tempter in the strength of those eternal universal truths on which the Son of God cast Himself in His hour of peril: "Man shall not live by bread alone, but by every word that proceedeth out of the mouth of God." "Thou shalt not tempt the Lord thy God." "Thou shalt worship the Lord thy God, and Him only shalt thou serve." You and I have free access at every moment to the Divine armoury from which

these weapons were drawn. "Thy words have I hid within my heart, that I should not sin against Thee." Yes, girt with the sword of the Spirit, which is the Word of God, we, like our Master, may calmly await the onset of the evil one, and our strength in the critical moment of trial and temptation must be found like His, in the firm hold which He can give us of the truths which never pass away.

OUR SEAMEN AS MISSIONARIES.

By the Rev. WILLIAM GUNTER, B.A., Rector of Abberton, Colchester.

Sermon Preached on behalf of the Missions to Seamen at Abberton, on December 23rd, 1892.

"Thy way is in the sea, and Thy path in the great waters, and Thy footsteps are not known."—Psalm lxxvii. 19.

DAVID, as we can see throughout the Psalms and other writings of his, was a man who thought more deeply and pondered more constantly over God's ways and workings than any other individual of whom we have any record at all. He seemed to be continually musing, as it were, over the mysterious providences of the great God of all, and then jotting down his thoughts as they arose, to the great gain and comfort of godly people ever since. And in this 77th Psalm he was evidently mystified more than usual, by the difficulties of life, in reviewing the changes and chances of poor humanity, and in the recollection of the strange, unlooked-for deliverances from evil he had himself experienced. He was trying, perhaps, to reduce God's ways to some system, to some orderly method of working out the threads of man's existence, upon a plan patent to all, till at last he was obliged to give it up as a task quite hopeless, and to confess, "Thy way, O God, is in the sea, and Thy path in the great waters, and Thy footsteps are not known."

And ever since David's day, up to the present time, has it been exactly the same. Though knowledge has increased to a marvellous extent—knowledge not only in the field of science, of art, of natural history, and of Biblical literature, and even though fresh streams of heavenly truth have been poured out from the very fountain-head, through the mouth of the Word Himself, the Lord Jesus, and from the mouths of His holy Apostles; yet still, in spite of these added blessings, we may muse and ponder too upon heavenly things, as David did, and yet be compelled to come to the same conclusion, and be forced also to confess, "that God's way is still in the sea, His path in the great waters, and His footsteps are unknown."

In all the providences of life it is so, in the successes and failures, or in what may seem to be the successes and failures, of schemes for the public good. In the machinery dedicated to God, and used in the spread of Christianity, it is so. To many who do not think very deeply upon the human agencies which distribute the Gospel news throughout the world, the means used for this purpose may appear to be simple enough, and to be clear enough, beyond question. They will tell you how it has been from the beginning, from the time when Christ commissioned His Apostles, and sent them forth, two by two, to preach the Gospel, to rebuke the evil to be found throughout the various lands, to correct the mistakes and enlighten the ignorance of those who were out of the way, and to speak in quiet, unhesitating, though glowing language about the last days, which had then come—spoken of ages before by the prophets—in which Jesus, the Son of God, should appear amongst suffering humanity as a Brother Sufferer, and bring peace to the conscience, and renewed life and hope to all who longed for it, by the offer of free forgiveness of sin, through the life which He was laying down for them. They will tell you how, since that first Christian age, this word of Peace has been spread abroad in a circle, radiating from its centre Jerusalem, generation after generation, other countries, in after ages, springing up and becoming centres of light, such as Rome, Ephesus, Athens, Alexandria; how schools have been founded, and the knowledge of God's Word taught in all languages; how men and women of zeal and talent and position have banded themselves together to carry on the work; how, about a thousand years ago, Great Britain was first admitted into Christian fellowship with other nations through the devotion and fearless love of a second St. Paul, so to speak; and how gradually, from that time, England has taken a foremost part in the diffusion of Christian truth until at the present day she stands the acknowledged head of missionary effort, her maritime power giving her the means, possessed by no other nation, of planting the Gospel in every nook and cranny of the inhabited globe. They will point to all this with pardonable pride, and say: "There is your machinery for this God's great work. England is the chosen nation for the preservation and the diffusion of Christianity. She bristles with missionary societies, she sends out thousands of godly, loving hearts to carry the good news to perishing souls, and these societies are furnished for the work by the willing contributions of countless numbers at home, only too glad to help in any way given them so to do." And right they would be, no doubt, so far. We may be thankful that God has allowed us to reach the position we hold as the chief of nations in missionary enterprise, and that such a network of Gospel teaching has for its centre of organisation the metropolis of our land.

But still, for all this, we may bear in mind that there are influences outside these organised schemes that bear very forcibly on the success of

these schemes for good or for evil; and it is when we ignore these outside influences, and fasten the mind on the recognised machinery alone, when we try to solve the mystery of the success or the failure of the various missionary societies, seeing the good cause either flourishing on the one hand, or dwindling and stagnant on the other, by fixing the praise or the blame either on the missionaries themselves, or on the societies they represent, we are driven more than ever into a corner, and have to cry out in our perplexity, "Thy way, O God, is in the sea, Thy path in the great waters, and Thy footsteps are not known."

It is for us, then, to study these outside influences, and in doing so this morning we approach the subject for which our support is asked to-day, the Missions to Seamen; for, involved in this particular mission, is an immense outside influence on Christian missions in general, not thought of so much as it deserves. Indirectly, our sailors throughout the world are, in spite of themselves, the most influential of all missionaries. There is no port, of whatever country, in which they are not to be found. The unfortunate thing is that just in the proportion in which they can be missionaries for good, so can they be missionaries for evil. But for the one or the other they must be, whether they will or no; there is no being neutral in the matter, for it is a simple question of character and example. One great object, then, of this Seamen's Mission is to make them missionaries for good. The Society has other views as well, other aims, viz., the temporal and spiritual comfort of the seamen themselves, and, in fact, beyond these objects this Society does not avowedly go. Any deputation from its head-quarters will tell you that this is their great aim and purpose; but when we dissect the work and position of the Society, and carefully weigh its claims upon our sympathy and support, we must not overlook this, the indirect, and, perhaps, unconscious value and help to other Christian missions, which are more directly employed in spreading Gospel truth amongst the heathen. For consider, for one moment, how the character and conduct and the religious views of our British seamen in foreign ports tend to make the Christian religion acceptable to the heathen dwelling in those ports, or, on the other hand, repulsive to them. Take any port in China, India, the African coast, West Indies, New Zealand, or wherever it may be. In the neighbourhood of these ports are working agents—say, from the Church Missionary Society, the Society for the Propagation of the Gospel, and various Nonconformist Christian Missionary Societies — to try and convert the poor natives of the district from the false, comfortless religions in which they have been brought up to the true faith in Jesus, the son of God, and are using all their talents, their energies, their power of argument, to prove the grand superiority of the Christian religion over all others in the world. They tell their congregations—or, rather, their audiences, whom they hope to turn into congregations—that the Christian life is one of extreme happiness of soul, that it brings peace of heart to all who embrace it, a life of purity, sobriety, happy love, and content here below, and a glorious hope of everlasting joy in the life that is to come. The audience departs, struck with the account of the noble qualities, priceless virtues, and hopes which are to be theirs on their becoming Christians, and are almost won over to the faith by the glowing language and friendly, loving entreaties of the preacher; and the first thing, perhaps, they meet in their streets is a noisy band of hearty English seamen, just landed on leave from that noble ship at anchor, flying the British flag, fresh from Christian England, and now freed for a few hours from the restraint and discipline of ship life, and only too eager to indulge in all the baser impulses of man, and hankering after strong drink and other fleshly gratifications without stint. These natives notice the reckless ways, the heated words, the staggering gait, the utter disregard of all courtesy and good manners of these Christian seamen, and they ponder over it all in astonishment, and argue to themselves, "If this is the result of Christianity with Christian people, then let me rather remain as I am—Brahmin, Hindoo, Mahommedan, Confucian, or whatever it may be. My own people are sober people; we live on quietly, one with another, without riot and disorder, though we may be ignorant. Why should I change, and become the opposite, like these Christians?" They judge a faith, as often we do ourselves the faith of our neighbours, by the unpremeditated lives of those who profess it under similar circumstances, and the result amongst these natives is often, unhappily, a repugnance at the start to the truths taught by the devoted Christian preacher from seeing the evil lives of the only examples of Christian men they happen to come across.

But supposing, on the other hand, dispersing from some such preaching of Gospel truth, these natives meet with English seamen of a different kind—and there are many such, we may say, with all thankfulness, seamen who have gladly themselves accepted the Gospel message, and are trying to honour Christ in their lives—supposing the natives see such as these landing in their midst, proceeding quietly along, perhaps to the market, the native bazaar, orderly, with kindly faces and pleasant manners, perhaps to the reading-room and sailors' home; and see them later on, most likely on the Sunday, attending the Christian place of worship, and returning to their ships and to their duty with cheerfulness and content, what must be the result? Why, simply this, that the words of the missionary preacher fall upon their ears with double force, and they begin to long to throw their lot into the scheme of salvation that has been set before them, which has had such evident good

effect upon the lives of the kind, orderly, happy English seamen they have seen landing upon their shores.

In this way, you see, brethren, the immense influence that our seamen have, unconsciously to themselves, for good or for evil, upon the efforts made by others to convert the heathen to Christianity; and it is therefore self-evident that the more the Christian welfare of our sailors is attended to, and supported by us at home, the greater will be their influence abroad for good amongst the poor, untaught worshippers of false gods, that are to be found in every port where British seamen congregate; and it is for this very purpose to promote this Christian welfare of these sailor-men, that this Society, this Mission to Seamen, exists. It is in the full view of this marvellous power, this influence of one Christian mind, one Christian life over another, that we cannot help feeling, "Thy way, O God, is in the sea, Thy path in the great waters, and Thy footsteps are not known."

God's way of working, of spreading His truths, is not confined to the preaching of the Word, but is seen in other ways—ways so mysterious that, although the result is plain enough, the track behind has vanished, as a vessel, though reaching the haven where she would be, has left behind her no visible pathway. Ask the Christian man what he has done to influence his companion or his neighbour to follow in his steps, and he will not be able to tell you; but it is most assuredly one of God's most powerful means, this great power of example. He has chosen to use in spreading throughout society and throughout the earth the knowledge of His will and the desire to fulfil the same. And no medium, brethren, to this end might, humanly speaking, be made more powerful than the individual lives and characters of the thousands of merchant and naval seamen who every year people the outskirts of almost every nation under the sun. They might become, in truth, the greatest, the most important of all our great missionary bodies, by being taught first of all themselves to love the Saviour and to try and follow His example, and then all unknowingly showing forth, by their lives, the fruits of such an example to those who are still in darkness and in the shadow of death.

I have said nothing of the details of the working of this Society, how it proceeds to try and render the life of the seaman more honourable, more Christianlike, and therefore more happy and attractive. You will find these details noted down in the small publications placed in the pews for your information; and this evening I hope to enlarge upon these details and show the various aspects of the Society's work, and the arrangements made in the different ports at home and abroad for the sailor's good.

In the meantime I would ask you to recognise the great importance of the work from the point of view spoken of this morning, and contribute what you can towards its support. It is little we can do, in such a small parish as this, towards the immense expense necessarily involved in carrying out the Mission's objects; but let us give what we really feel we are able to do, and that willingly, and we may be quite sure of fulfilling God's great law of all such ministering to another's need: "Let every man do according as he is disposed in his heart, not grudgingly or of necessity, for God loveth a cheerful giver."

DEFINITE PRAYER.

By the Rev. H. H. TILNEY BASSETT, Senior Curate of Northam.

Sermon Preached at Holy Trinity, Westward Ho! on Quinquagesima Sunday, February 12th, 1893.

"And Jesus answered and said unto him, What wilt thou that I should do unto thee? The blind man said, Lord, that I might receive my sight."—St. Mark x. 51.

THERE is a marked difference in the way in which our Saviour dealt with those who sought His aid, during the earlier part of His earthly career, to that which characterised His dealings with them during the closing scenes of His life on earth.

In the earlier days of His ministry He healed those that applied to Him for help immediately, we hear never a word or question asked. There is a man before Him, he has a withered hand, and at once the Saviour says, "Stretch forth thine hand," and it is restored whole as the other. At another time there is one paralysed, lying on a couch, and with a word He tells him to take up his bed and walk, and at once he is made whole.

But afterwards, towards the closing scenes of His earthly career, there was frequently a question asked of those that sought His aid, "Wilt thou be made whole?" or, as in our text, "What wilt thou that I shall do unto thee?"

Doubtless there is much for us to learn from all this, as there must ever be from all our Lord's dealings with men, and perhaps it is this. During the earlier days of our Lord's life on earth, it was necessary that He should impress men with His power, His knowledge, and His readiness to help all in need, that He knew our sorrows and was acquainted with our grief, that He needed not that any one should testify to Him concerning man.

Afterwards we find He asks frequently a question, He draws a confession, He desires that they should tell Him what their special wants were. This was surely to teach us to know ourselves, and consequently to teach us how to pray.

Thus we find in the passage before us our Lord was on His way to Jerusalem, and whilst engrossed

in deep and earnest conversation with His disciples, suddenly a cry falls upon His ears; it is the cry of helplessness, and yet it is the cry of hope; it is the cry of a poor blind man. To that poor man the whole of life had been one deep dark night, the brilliant heavens above had never cleared from cloud, and the beautiful pictures of nature around him a thick mist had never ceased to conceal, and there he sits in such a case feeling his way as he comes in the morning, and depending upon others to tell him when it was night.

But upon this day an unusual murmur of many voices, passing through the city gates, calls forth all his attention, and on his inquiring, he is told that Jesus of Nazareth is passing by. At once all that he has heard of this wonderful Personage rushes through his mind, and instantly he rends the air with his earnest and heartfelt prayer, "Lord, Thou Son of David, have mercy upon me."

And hearing that prayer, Jesus stood still and commanded him to be brought unto Him, and now mark what follows. The Saviour puts a question to him that must have startled and struck with astonishment all those around Him. Was it not clear to all what was the need of that poor man? Was it not plain to all that he was blind? Could not Jesus see this? Is there any need of further witness? Wherefore then does Jesus ask him, "What wilt thou that I should do unto thee?"

Surely there must be a deep significance in all this, something very special for us to learn. Now, in viewing our Lord's dealings with individual cases, we constantly notice that He uses the incident as affording an opportunity for enforcing some deep spiritual lesson on the minds of those around Him.

This, you will remember, was specially the case with the sickness and death of Lazarus. Our Lord, we are told, when He heard of his sickness, abode two days still in the same place where He was; and then as He was on His way to raise him from the dead, He told His disciples the reason of His apparent neglect, it was for their sakes: "I was glad for your sakes that I was not there to the intent that ye might believe." The delay then was to strengthen and establish their faith. And so here our Lord makes the cure of this blind man the occasion of impressing an important lesson respecting prayer upon those around Him, and it was a plain one, too.

Surely it was this, prayer must be more than general and vague petitions. What our Lord would impress upon us here is, we must be definite in our devotions. This poor man had been crying a great deal, "Have mercy upon me, O Lord, Thou Son of David;" but he never expressed any definite request, he had cried much for help, but for what help he had not defined.

Is not this, too, brethren, how prayer is but too frequently offered? Is not this oft the fault of the prayers of sincere people, too? There is a lack of definition and point, there is a lack of definite purpose.

Now our Lord would arrest such devotion with these words, "What wilt thou that I should do unto thee?"

Now, if we pause a moment, we recognise why our Saviour so emphasised the need of definite prayer. Oh, it is not that He needeth that any should testify to Him, for He knows our necessities before we ask, but for our sakes, for our good.

In the first place, it impels us to examine ourselves, to search out what is our real need; it checks all hasty running into God's presence without due thought and preparation; it checks, too, at once all vague, empty, and meaningless utterances, that, alas! we all too frequently fall into, that crying for deliverance from sin, but from what sin we scarcely know; that pointless ejaculation for help, but for what help we have not considered; that empty petition for blessings, but for what blessing we have given no thought.

But now, if we place these searching words of our Saviour before us, "What wilt thou that I should do unto thee?" as addressed to ourselves, as we approach the throne of grace that we may obtain mercy and find grace to help us, they prepare us to meet our God, they make us pause, they make us search out the sin, the temptation, the influence that easiest overcomes us. Yes, they at once teach us to know ourselves, our weakness, our sinfulness, our infirmities, our need of a Saviour.

But more, mindful of these words of our Saviour, think what earnestness they must create in our hearts, what purpose of spirit, what point they must impart to our prayers; for having definitely considered what we are about to ask, having discovered the soul's real present need, now we have a check to all wandering of thoughts, we cannot draw near now with the lip, and honour with the mouth, with our hearts far from God, for we have a specially considered request to make, a special thanksgiving to offer, a special mercy to beseech. No! mindful of our Saviour's words, placing these words before us as we approach Him, "What wilt thou that I should do unto thee?" Prayer can no longer be empty to us; our utterance must now be full of meaning, full of fervour, full of earnestness; it will become the true worship in spirit and truth, which God the Father seeks of those that worship Him.

But, again, we think there may be a further reason why our Lord lays such stress upon definite prayer, not only because it tends to make us search our hearts and know ourselves, not only because it creates earnestness and checks all wandering thoughts, but because it makes us look for a definite answer, and also know when our prayers are answered. When prayer is only general and vague, we can look for no special answer, for there has been no special prayer.

This poor man, doubtless, stood in need of many

things besides restoration of sight. He was a poor blind beggar; his prayer, simply for mercy, would have been equally answered had our Lord bestowed upon him some other gift than his sight. But, knowing what he really longed for, our Lord led him to make his request definite by the startling question, "What wilt thou that I should do unto thee?" which made him at once exclaim, "Lord, that I may receive my sight," and at once his direct prayer made him expect a definite answer. And such is the lesson our Lord impresses upon us; if we are to expect and look for answers to our prayers, they must be definite and full of reality and purpose.

Ah! the disciples long ago had asked Jesus to teach them how to pray. He answered them then. He gave them a form of prayer. Here again He is still continuing the great lesson, and now teaches them something more as to the manner of prayer: prayer must be definite. He has yet a further important lesson to teach them, that prayer must be made to the Father in His name: "Hitherto have ye asked nothing in My name; ask and ye shall receive, that your joy may be full. Whatsoever ye shall ask the Father in My name, He will give it you." Yes, the disciples are taught the great truth which we do well to grasp and attend to in all our researches for spiritual progress, that there is only one way of attaining it, and that is by giving earnest heed, not to occasional utterances only, but to every word that proceedeth out of the mouth of the Lord.

Brethren, we are just about to enter upon the season of Lent, a season that specially calls us to self-examination. Can we do better than beginning with an earnest and diligent inquiry into the state of our prayerful life? for, alas! is it not possible often to say a prayer and yet never to pray? Oh, if we would pray aright, with reverence and with fear! Perhaps nothing will promote it more than when we fall on our knees before the throne of grace to place these words of our Saviour, so full of purpose, before us, and regard them as addressed to ourselves: "What wilt thou now that I should do unto thee?"

"O Thou, by whom we come to God,
The Life, the Truth, the Way;
The path of prayer Thyself hast trod,
Lord, teach us how to pray."

ON Tuesday, 14th ult., the clergy of the Rural Deanery of Pocklington, in chapter assembled, under the presidency of the Rev. H. B. L. Puxley, Rural Dean, resolved to summon the chief Churchmen of the Deanery to a meeting at Pocklington to emphasise the fact that the Church in Wales is an integral portion of the Church of England, and to take action in the present crisis. It was stated that addresses had been given under the auspices of the Pocklington Deanery Sanitary Association and a sanitary aid committee appointed. The Council of the Pocklington Deanery Society for the Promotion of Kindness to Dumb Animals reported that branches had been formed and members enrolled.

NOTICES.

All communications respecting the Literary portion of the paper should be addressed to the Editor.

Business communications of every kind should be addressed to Mr. S. GIBBON, at the CHURCH OF ENGLAND PULPIT Office, 160, Fleet Street, London, E.C., to whom cheques and Post-office orders for subscriptions (in advance), three months, 2s., six months, 3s. 6d., twelve months, 6s. 6d., are to be made payable.

The Cases for binding Vol. XXXIV. are now ready.

FOR HEALTH AND IMMORTALITY.

The Ecclesiastical Review.

SATURDAY, APRIL 1, 1893.

CLERICAL PIRATES.

WHAT is a poor parson to do when he wants "temporary assistance"—not pecuniary, but professional. In the old days it was easy enough, services were few and hours elastic, and a man's neighbours never grudged him a holiday. Now things are different, services have multiplied, almost to bewilderment, and there are so many calls upon a clergyman that it is very difficult to help anybody else, even for a service. The result has been a class of clergymen who make this work almost a speciality, and do it very ill. The conditions are pleasant to a man rather lazy and fond of change, and the pay is good; there is no reason why the men should not be good, too. But they seldom are. Of course there are a certain number of respectable clergymen who are from time to time open to temporary engagements. But the great majority of them are clerical riff-raff and demireps—men whose characters would not bear investigation, or who are, for other reasons, ineligible for respectable permanent employment. There are always bound to be a certain number of black sheep in so large a flock as the Anglican ministry, and these persons contrive, for the most part, by means of agents and advertisements, to pick up an easy, if ignoble, living, by going out "charing." There used to be an office in Regent-street kept for the supply of these fellows. The manager was generally found in shirt-sleeves, with clerical collar and waistcoat, and a short pipe and a pot of beer. His appearance was well-known to many London incumbents who, being pressed for help, were tempted by his advertisement to call; he preferred letters. There is a "temporary" man now

(his benefice is in sequestration), who is pestering a South of England rector with anonymous letters, having failed to blackmail him. A well-known vicar in the West-end of London, having made an appointment with one of these "pirates," was obliged to keep him waiting five minutes. His visitor, who, it seems, had arrived drunk, angrily refused to wait, and reeled off to a post-office, from which he sent a long, threatening, and abusive telegram. The vicar good-naturedly requested the agent, himself a parson, to send him no more maniacs. The hospitality which is part of the pay of these "pirates" has its risks. A country rector, having entertained a temporary man, found he had left his best bedroom a permanent legacy of even less desirable occupants. And so on, there is hardly an incumbent of any standing who has not some unpleasant tale to tell of what happened when he stood in need of "temporary assistance."

What is the reason of this thusness? After all there is no disgrace in doing a day's duty for a day's pay. The demand for temporary help is perfectly legitimate, and should be legitimately supplied. First of all the pirates ought to be got rid of, and that is comparatively easy. If unworthy priests cannot be deprived of orders or rendered legally incapable, the bishops are at least able to prevent their clergy from employing them. Some do, but many do not; diocesan rules are often lax, or interpreted with laxity. But there ought to be a hard-and-fast rule in all dioceses that no clergyman should do a day's duty without episcopal permission, and all incumbents should be expected loyally to obey it. That would make an end of the pirates.

And it would not be difficult to supply their place. A very great deal might be done by means of the non-parochial clergy, who are numerous in all dioceses. It might be very properly made a condition with them that they should be ready to do such duty as the bishops may assign to them from time to time. And that condition might be extended to schoolmasters in orders, fellows of colleges, and so forth. An occasional Sunday's work could be no hardship.

This would go far towards supplying the needs of most dioceses. But, in addition, the bishops might well maintain a small body of assistant chaplains for the purpose of temporary work. Often they would be volunteers. There are many men of independent means who would be thankful for the privilege of occasionally ministering without the burden of constant responsibility. And the fees which already maintain so many unworthy priests would maintain the same number of better men who could not *give* their services.

The matter is worth attention, if only for the sake of putting one more spoke in the wheel of rascals. "Criminous clerks" are a cause of much worry and scandal, and, apart from the great benefit conferred on the clergy, it would be advantageous, by taking some wise order in this affair of temporary work, to shut off one of the sources from which they draw supplies.

FOR THE IRISH LOYALISTS.

THE work of raising the voice of the country against Mr. Gladstone's Home Rule Bill has now begun in earnest, and every day we read of enthusiastic meetings being held in all parts of the country to protest against its becoming law. In London its opponents have not been idle, as witness the splendid deputation of bankers, merchants, stockbrokers, and others connected with the City of London, in the present week to Mr. Gladstone. Everywhere it is the same—deep, resolute oppositon as expressed so earnestly in those significant words of the Duke of Abercorn—"We will not have Home Rule." There is, however, a great deal to be done yet. Englishmen and Scotchmen have, irrespective of all the various financial and other difficulties in the way, to decide how best they can fulfil their duty to that large Loyalist minority whom they themselves placed in Ireland, and for whom they are, therefore, more or less directly responsible. The Loyalists would be the first to suffer if anything were to happen to shake the power that has hitherto for so many years preserved peace between the different races, and assisted to develop their resources and to protect them in their prosperity. If we might point a moral to the Unionist party we would ask each individual member so to conduct hlmself in the great trial and political struggle, as if upon him individually depended the success of the cause. We can well believe that many of the Liberal party are to-day rubbing their eyes and wondering what is to come out of this present state of things. Mr. Gladstone, with all his great ability, with all his great powers of expression and eloquence, and with all the remarkable versatility that he possesses, Mr. Gladstone has had one very fatal habit all through his life—it is that of putting himself in untenable positions and of having to retire from them. It is certain, if Unionists are only true to themselves, that he will not be able to maintain his present position with regard to Ireland much longer. But, if the forces of the great Unionist party in the country are overpowered, it will be a shame to those who do not know how to use them. Differing as the two branches of the party do upon many important matters, it is clear that the first and foremost vital question of the day is that of the repeal of the Union. All other questions must, therefore, be of secondary importance. All divisions of the great army must fight shoulder to shoulder; even the meanest soldier in the rank and file is a brick n that solid wall of opposition which must check

and frustrate the designs of an enemy who would put back the wheels of time 200 years and land us again in the throes of civil war ; who would destroy in a day that constitution which it has taken 800 years to build up, and involve the whole empire in humiliation and disaster. Let all Unionists, therefore, be on the alert, and let slip no opportunity to secure a return of prosperity and security for the Loyalists of Ireland.

GOOD RESOLUTIONS.

By the Rev. E. VERE HODGE, M.A., Head Master of Oakham School.

An Address delivered to the Scholars of Oakham School.

It is the beginning of a new school year, and this new beginning may bring with it many thoughts. We have had our work gathered up and garnered, and we ought to have held a day of reckoning for ourselves as well, for we can reckon up our own accounts better than any one else can reckon them for us ; and thus we can tell whether we ought to have the satisfaction of a good conscience, we can tell whether we ought to reproach ourselves with a year wasted, or have the happiness of being able to look back upon a year well spent.

Now we are beginning again. Whatever the past year was, most of us begin with good resolutions ; we determine to make better use of our times in future, to make our school life develop not only through the growth of knowledge, but also through growth in Christian faith.

We must first consider what our good resolutions are to be about. I think that we shall all agree that they must be about our work here and our life here, our school work and our school life. What is our work here? It is not only to acquire knowledge ; that is indeed an important part of your school work, but at the same time it is only a part ; it it had been the whole it would have been unreasonable for many of you to come here at all. You might have gone to day-schools ; but as it is, your parents sent you here because they hoped that you would gain not only knowledge, but also that training which arises from intimate social intercourse with others of your own age, and with masters whose aim is not only to teach you with a view to mere success in life, but also that you may become in the highest sense Christian gentlemen.

Now let us consider a little further this work of ours which demands so many good resolutions. These are some of the lessons which we have to learn. To give up our own will and do what is disagreeable to us, to abhor self-indulgence, and to be patient under discomfort, to sacrifice ourselves, to learn our duty to our fellow-men, to learn to look with a kindly eye on their faults, to be truthful, to set such an example that others will not be led to harm. There is quite enough reason for good resolutions, but all these good resolutions are of no avail unless they are aided by thought, determination, and prayer. A clever man's clever thoughts are of no use to the world unless they are written down ; otherwise his wise speeches, or his able plans, or his ingenious inventions soon pass away and are forgotten, and no one is benefited by them. That is the evil of the emotional side of religion. You know well how people may be stirred up by an eloquent speech, which appeals to their feelings, perhaps by their surroundings, by a beautiful building or beautiful music ; they are carried away and are carried out of themselves. It is quite natural. Who that has ever stood in one of our cathedrals, looking up to those lofty roofs and wondering at the perfect art, and at the patience and endurance of our forefathers, who followed out their plan from generation to generation ; who that has heard the music ringing from side to side through those vast arches, and seeming to gather strength as it rolls along, can possibly feel unmoved? His feelings are worked upon by the scene ; it is no mere sentimental folly, but a natural means of encouragement to our better thoughts and our better resolutions.

I would not at all discourage good resolutions ; on the contrary, I would welcome anything that would excite them ; I would hail gladly any event in our lives, whether of pleasure or pain, which would call upon us to make them. No one can do anything without good resolutions ; but I would say make them and make them last, too ; let them be no mere temporary effort, no seed sown on rocky ground which springs up quickly and so soon withers away ; but let them bear good lasting fruit. For, remember, your good resolutions represent your highest thoughts, so to fall away from them and not to carry them out shows a sort of cowardice ; it proves that you know the right and do the wrong ; it proves that you have capacity for higher things, but choose the lower lot, perhaps because you are tired of making efforts, perhaps because you are tempted by others who are more ignorant, and so you sink to their level instead of trying to raise them to yours. So I would say, have the courage of your opinions, do not be beaten down by intercourse with the world ; make resolutions, not merely in excitement, when you hardly know what you are doing, but make them in cold blood, and with the deliberate purpose that the accomplishment shall exceed the design ; and let your energy in carrying out your resolutions increase day by day, and not be worn out by the difficulties that appear in the way

We are just passing a crisis in our school existence, our tercentenary ; our minds have been thrown back, and we have been reviewing the past history of our school, as exemplified in the scholars of old time. We have heard a good deal about their strength and their weakness, about their good deeds and their bad ones ; and, I can say for myself, many things which were told me by the old boys of many generations who were lately amongst us, made me think very deeply of the present state of our school : ought we to be proud of our school as it is at present ; ought we to be content, or ought we to be dissatisfied? And these are questions not only for me as headmaster, and as standing in the position of a parent to my house boys for a great part of the year, not only to the other masters, but they are questions for you to consider yourselves, every one of you, and especially for those who from their age and position are the natural leaders amongst you. I am afraid many of us, in thinking over such things, are apt to consider only the mere outside work, the success in games, the success in scholarship, or perhaps the success in after life of the old boys. But, remember, this is not enough, this is the mere shell of the nut ; there is a kernel, there are ambitions far higher than these, and there are honours which

the school can gain far more brilliant and far more lasting.

It is our lot to begin again. We summed up the results of 300 years at our tercentenary celebration, and now it is our turn to show what we can do. We have a fine past here, and I think we may rightly glory in it; but at the same time there ought to be a spirit of rivalry between us and the past, a spirit of generous competition with them; we should hold the opinion, I will not say that what they have done we can do, but what they have done we *ought* to be able to do. I do not see why this school should not produce as great men as ever it did, only it must have the same energy, the same patience of hard work, and the same determination to succeed; but we have all heard enough about the success of the past. There is one record that we cannot trace (and our time, too, must have the same record too)—it is the list of those who fell out of the race, the list of those whose names we have never heard of, or perhaps heard spoken of, with a few ominous words of regret by their friends.

How many shall we have to chronicle in years to come who have fallen out of the race, and have lost their chances in life through bad habits learnt at school, or if not learnt, yet encouraged; or if not encouraged, yet not checked. There was a great Greek statesman who was asked by his friends when on his death-bed of which of his great exploits he was most proud, and this was his answer: "That no citizen ever put on mourning through me." Now all these successes of different kinds are all very well; you know that we masters are almost as keen as you are yourselves for your success in games, and more so for your success in work. But we should like this to be the highest ambition of this school and all connected with it that not one should be lost. It would indeed be a great achievement if in days to come we could take out our old roll-calls, as the Bishop of Hereford did, and read name after name without meeting one which brought back painful memories, without recalling one whose history we are ashamed to trace.

Reviews and Notices.

"LIGHT AND TRUTH." A Record of Church Reformation work in Spain, Portugal, etc. Edited by the Rev. H. E. Noyes, D.D. London: Partridge. Dublin: Hodges.

ONE of the most inexplicable phenomena of the religion of our times is, that all the world seems to be dissatisfied with its own ancestral beliefs and practices. While in England there is a general hankering after ceremony and superstition, through which it has become common and fashionable to worship, or pretend to worship, the bread and wine of the Holy Communion, and to indulge in various other practices verging on idolatry, there may be seen in the Latin countries a strong disposition to revolt against the teaching of the priests, and to demand a return to the simpler Christianity which came from Christ Himself. Archbishop Plunket's work in Spain and Portugal, of which the periodical before us contains a record, shows that such a tendency exists in those two countries. The small community of reformed Christians, episcopally organised, for whom that prelate has, after great difficulties, provided a church at Madrid, evidently enjoys a considerable amount of popular favour, and has no opposition to dread except from the Government, the aristocracy, and the priests. Whether primitive Christianity will eventually reassert itself in Spain, Portugal, Italy, and France, at the very time when England seems to be turning more and more towards the later and corrupter developments of the religion, is a question the answer to which Providence reserves for future generations. Though we shall not see ourselves the effect of the Archbishop's work, we cannot but take the greatest interest in it, especially since it has met with opposition and obloquy from many who ought to have been its most earnest supporters; and we therefore heartily recommend to our readers the above little quarterly periodical, in which they will find the latest intelligence on this subject.

CORRESPONDENCE.

To the Editor of the CHURCH OF ENGLAND PULPIT AND ECCLESIASTICAL REVIEW.

ΑΔΟΚΙΜΟΣ.

SIR,—Mr. Hobson, in the PULPIT of 18th March, objects to the use of the word heresy in its ecclesiastical sense of an entire system of perverted doctrine, like Romanism or Calvinism. It is true that the Scriptural sense of the word is merely schism. But we do not need a synonym for schism, and unhappily we do need a word for "heresy in the ecclesiastical sense."

I do not question that many Calvinists have been lights and ornaments of the Church of Christ. I believe a man may hold heretical doctrine without being himself a heretic.

JOSEPH JOHN MURPHY.

Belfast, March 26th, 1893.

MR. ERNEST HART, editor of the *British Medical Journal*, speaking at the March monthly meeting of the Church of England Sanitary Association, at the Church House, Westminster, said that it was the ecclesiastical duty of the clergy to inculcate the laws of public health and personal hygiene.

SUGGESTIVE OUTLINES FOR SUNDAY SCHOOL TEACHERS AND LAY WORKERS.—Apostolic Council: Read Acts xv. 12-29. 1. We cannot be saved but by the grace of God. 2. We cannot be saved without Christ's help. 3. We cannot be saved without repentance. 4. We cannot make excuse regarding our salvation. 5. We cannot but mark God's love to all. 6. We cannot truly seek God's mercy through Christ in vain. 7. We cannot delay the day of salvation with safety. 8. We cannot put off the day of our death. Learn, we are invited simply to accept the salvation of Christ. God is willing to save them that call upon Him.—By Thomas Heath, Plymouth.

LORD GRIMTHORPE has written to the Hon. Secretary of the Burial Reform Association as follows:—"I agree generally with the objects of the Burial Reform Association, especially the discouraging of brick graves or vaults, lead coffins, keeping bodies unburied longer than is absolutely necessary, and every kind of contrivance for continuing as long as possible the process of unconsumed putrefaction, and the consequent production of malarious gas; and also the

sadly increased pagan practice of corpse-worship in every possible way, by heaps of flowers, often continued for months and years in tin cans and wire cages —which it has been decided by the Court of Appeal that people have no right to do—and absurd funeral expenditure for the benefit of nobody but undertakers, and the gratification of vulgar vanity, often by people who get into debt for it, and actually think that meritorious and a ground for begging afterwards. I told Archbishop Magee that I would do all I could to help his Bill for restricting the insurance of children's lives, which evidently tends in exactly the opposite direction to insuring their lives, and is a constant temptation to direct or indirect murder. But I know there are difficulties in the way of making such a Bill satisfactory, and indeed in passing one at all in the face of the opposition which it naturally excites; and therefore I doubt the expediency of combining that with the indisputably good objects above mentioned, and for which I send you an order for an annual subscription."

PREFERMENTS AND APPOINTMENTS.

Bate, Rev. Edward, B.A.; Chaplain Priest of Clewer House of Mercy, Berks.

Besant, Rev. John Charles Eldridge, M.A., Curate of Ludlow; Vicar of Lydney-with-Aylburton, Gloucestershire.

Bevis, Rev. Henry, M.A., Curate-in-Charge of Middle Chinnock, Yeovil; Vicar of Arlingham, Gloucestershire.

Brownhill, Rev. J. J., B.A, Curate of St. John's, Blackheath; Chaplain of the Woolwich Union and Infirmary.

Cheshire, Rev. John Griffith, M.A., Rector of Kingston, Cambridge; Vicar of Witcham, Ely.

Cole, Rev. Arthur, B.A.; Licensed to Officiate as a Deacon and to Preach, whilst Assistant-Master in Berkhamsted School.

Colmore, Rev. William Harrison, M.A., Vicar of Moseley; Chaplain to the High Sheriff of Warwickshire (Mr. Henry Fisher).

Dickson, Rev. David, Vicar or Perpetual Curate of Christ Church. Lowestoft, Suffolk; Surrogate for the Diocese of Norwich.

Elcum, Rev. Charles C., M.A., Vicar of St. Agnes's, Toxteth Park, Liverpool; Acting Chaplain to the 6th Lancashire Artillery Volunteers.

Green, Rev. Charles Alfred Howell, Curate; Vicar of Aberdare.

Goss, Rev. Thomas, M.A., Vicar of St. James's, Carlisle; Vicar of St. Mary's, Peckham.

White, Rev. Joseph Henry, M.A., Rector of Brattleby; Rector of Brockdish, Norfolk.

Williams, Rev. Thomas, B.A., Curate of Denio; Curate-in-Charge of St. Bartholomew's, Devonport.

CLERICAL OBITUARY.

Blackett, Rev. William Russell, Principal of the Home and Colonial Training College, at 22, Taviton-street, on the 26th ult., aged 56.

Davies, Rev. Uriah, for over thirty-two years Vicar of St. Matthew's, Canonbury, at 3, Willow-bridge-road, Canonbury, on the 22nd ult., aged 71.

Machen, Rev. Edward, late Rector of Staunton, and formerly of Micheldean, at Bicknor Court, Coleford, Gloucestershire, on the 26th ult., aged 75.

O'Connor, Rev. Harry King, M.A., Senior Garrison Chaplain, formerly Vicar of Locking, at Benares, on the 8th ult.

Shepherd, Rev. R., for upwards of twenty years Vicar of Husborne Crawley, at 25, Gery-street, Bedford, on the 22nd ult., aged 79.

Slack, Rev. Humphrey Archer, M.A, Rector of East Woolfardisworthy, at 3, Bystock-terrace, Exeter, on the 22nd ult., aged 54.

Wray, Rev. George Octavius, LL.D., formerly Vicar of Brockenhurst, Hants, at Chilton-house, Surbiton-hill, on the 18th ult., aged 70.

FIRST REMOVE THE CAUSE.

MEN frequently worry and trouble themselves a great deal in trying to cure the symptoms of vital weakness nervous exhaustion, and kindred ailments, instead of endeavouring to first remove the cause. This can be done by Mr. Harness' Electropathic Treatment without the aid of drugs. It is useless to tell sufferers to employ their minds and bodies in useful work and to forget their disorders, so long as the cause of their troubles is not removed. How can it be expected that when they are fatigued by the least exertion they can occupy themselves by studying, walking, or other exercise? Even in conversation they frequently lose the thread of it and repeatedly find their memory failing them. What can they do? Physic will not cure them—perhaps the leading physicians have failed to afford them any relief, and they have consequently become hopeless. It is to such as these that Mr. Harness' new combined Electropathic Belt and Suspensory is so strongly recommended, as, by its gentle but continuous action, invigorating electric currents are imperceptibly generated and conveyed direct from the spinal cord to the affected parts. It is this scientifically constructed and convenient appliance which silently but surely acts upon the vital organs, and removes the cause of the patient's disease, effecting a wonderful change in his health, character, and conduct, and speedily enabling him to return to his natural tastes and habits, and enjoy once more the full vigour of youth, with all its accompanying pleasures.

We may add that this perfect Electro-medical appliance is exceedingly comfortable to wear, gives wonderful support and vitality to all the internal organs of the body, prevents chills, imparts new life and vigour to the debilitated constitution, stimulates the organic action, promotes the circulation, assists digestion, and promptly renews that vital energy, the loss of which is the first symptom of decay. Its healing properties are multifarious. It stimulates the functions of various organs, increases their secretions, gives tone to muscle and nerves, relaxes morbid contractions, improves nutrition, and effectually renews exhausted nerve force. Acting directly on the system, it sustains and assists its various functions, and thus promotes the health and vigour of the entire frame. Besides these benefits, the mind is maintained in a buoyant, cheerful state, and every faculty is stimulated to the highest condition of intellectual strength.

Gentlemen who read the above announcement have only to visit London and call at the Electropathic and Zander Institute (52, Oxford Street, W.) to be convinced of the marvellous curative powers of Electricity and Mr. Harness' perfect methods of imperceptibly applying the current. The medical officers of the establishment are in daily attendance, and may be consulted free of charge either personally or by letter.

The Church of England Pulpit.

A LOOK AT HOME.

By the Rev. J. REID, Rector.

Sermon Preached in Newtownsaville Church, on Sunday, January 15th, 1893.

"What have these men seen in thine house."—2 Kings xx. 14, 15.

HEZEKIAH was the best of the few good kings of Judah. His life was as an oasis in the desert, since he was the son of a bad father, and was succeeded by a wicked son. His father Ahaz had set him a very bad example, and had probably given him a bad education, yet he was full of zeal for the glory of God, and wrought a mighty reformation in the national worship.

He was sincerely devoted to God, and delighted in his service, in which he persevered to the end of his days. He removed the monuments of idolatry, and suppressed the worship of the high places which had existed for many ages. So it is said in the 18th chapter (3, 4, and 5 verses) that "he did that which was right in the sight of the Lord according to all that David his father did. He removed the high places, brake the images, cut down the groves, and brake in pieces the brazen serpent that Moses had made: for unto those days the children of Israel did burn incense to it: and he called it Nehushtan. He trusted in the Lord God of Israel, so that after him was none like him among all the Kings of Judah, nor any that were before him." He emulated David in the strength of his faith, the power of his love, and the earnestness and fervour of his zeal and piety, without being drawn into any of those scandalous sins which stained David's character, and so greatly marred his happiness.

As the prophet Isaiah lived during his reign no doubt he was the friend and counsellor of Hezekiah in all important matters, and much of his success, under God, may be attributed to the prophet's wise counsels and unfailing help. Even the brazen serpent, the symbol of their deliverance from a terrible evil, and which had been preserved as a memorial of their gratitude, was destroyed without hesitation by Hezekiah in his reforming zeal, when it became an object of superstitious veneration and idolatrous worship, thus teaching us that in the service and worship of God, things harmless in themselves, but which may become the cause or occasion of evil, are to be avoided. The superstitious veneration paid to so-called sacred relics in one branch of the Christian Church, and the adoration of the supposed wood and nails of the Cross, correspond exactly to the veneration of the brazen serpent by the Israelites, and ought to be abolished.

The history of Hezekiah's reign is narrated in the 18th, 19th, and 20th chapters of the 2nd Book of Kings, and with somewhat greater fulness of detail in the 29th, 30th, 31st and 32nd chapters of 2nd Chronicles; and the verdict of Holy Writ in regard to him is that throughout all Judah he wrought that which was good, and right, and truth before the Lord his God. And in every work that he began in the service of the house of God, and in the law, and in the commandments to seek his God, he did it with all his heart, and prospered (2 Chron. xxxi. 21). Still

> "There is no sun that shineth,
> But hath its spots of shade."

There is wisdom in not thinking too highly of poor human clay, and charity in not judging it too harshly. Great minds have their imperfections, and great saints and eminent servants of God have had their failings and infirmities. Neither human beings nor human systems are perfect. To cover the imperfections of poor erring sinful mortals, we must look to the mercy of God, and the perfect righteousness of Christ Jesus. And in churches and human systems men must work with the imperfect machinery they can find rather than wait for the perfection they can never have. Hence, we should be tolerant of what may seem to us irregular methods of doing good, provided the good be really done.

Even in New Testament times when Christianity was in its infancy, and had enough to contend with in the hostile forces of Judaism and heathenism, it was not exempt from divisions within. So we read that Paul and Barnabas contended, and the contention was so sharp between them that they parted, each taking a separate field for his missionary labours.

Both could not be right, and probably there were faults on both sides. And when we remember the sin of Noah, the dissimulation of Abraham, the deceit of Jacob, the grievous fall of David, the timidity of Elijah, the denial of Peter, and the imperfections and shortcomings of the Reformers of England and the Continent, many of whom laid down their lives for the truths they held so dear, we see the wisdom of not expecting too much of poor human nature, or looking for perfection even in the best. This, however, is not intended to extenuate evil, for sin is still sin, and hateful to God by whomsoever committed.

Hezekiah, though so distinguished for his piety and zeal in the service of God, was no exception to the rule. He showed the messengers of the King of Babylon all that was in his house. This was one of the most reprehensible acts of his life,

for which he was severely reproved by the prophet, speaking in the name of the Lord. And though the threatened judgment was suspended during Hezekiah's lifetime, it fell heavily upon his descendants.

Whether he did this in the pride of his heart, from mere ostentation and a desire to show his wealth and splendour, or from timidity and fear, and a desire to conciliate his visitors, the act was wrong of itself and should not have been done.

If he did it through pride then he manifested a dangerous spirit, and if he did it through weakness and fear, he ought rather to have trusted in God for strength and protection against his enemies. It is perhaps difficult to possess distinctions of wealth and rank and talents, elegant furniture and splendid equipages, and not cherish (at least secretly) the desire that others should see and admire the wealth, or taste, or splendour of the possessors. This feeling is a very subtle and dangerous one, but pride and ostentation should have no place where gratitude and thankfulness alone should rule the heart.

What have these men seen in thine house, asked the prophet; and Hezekiah answered, "All the things that are in mine house have they seen: there is nothing among my treasures that I have not showed them."

Hezekiah does not seem to have thought that in this he was doing anything wrong. But we are apt to judge ourselves too easily, and examine ourselves too superficially. This is often in striking contrast with the severe judgments men pronounce on others, and the searching criticism to which they will subject their motives and actions. How easy it is to go wrong and incur the displeasure of the Almighty. How circumspectly should men walk. And how earnestly and constantly should they call upon God "to whom all hearts are open, all desires known, and from whom no secrets are hid," as David did: "Hold up my goings in thy paths that my footsteps slip not."

Hezekiah in this stumbled badly. So shall we too stumble and fall, and not only fall, but remain fallen, unless we are upheld and sustained by Divine Power. "For thy name's sake," says the Psalmist again, "lead me and guide me" (xxxi. 3). This prayer for Divine guidance is finely expressed in one of our well known hymns thus:—

> "Guide us, O thou great Jehovah,
> Pilgrims through this barren land;
> We are weak, but Thou art mighty,
> Hold us with Thy powerful hand.
> Bread of heaven
> Feed us till we want no more."

"What have these men seen in thine house?" No doubt we are ready to say that Hezekiah acted very foolishly, as David confessed he had done when lifted up by pride to number the people. But instead of passing a severe judgment on the King of Judah, let us consider the matter in the light of modern history, and examine ourselves. Israel once possessed a great and distinguished leader, Joshua, who at an important era in their history gave them this advice, "Choose you this day whom you will serve;" and then he hesitated not to tell them his own choice, "As for me and my house, we will serve the Lord." One thing any one visiting the house of Joshua would have seen, the conduct, temper, and demeanour of people who worshipped the Lord their God, and served Him only. There was at least one family in Israel where God was honoured, and His name held in reverence, and that too the family of highest rank in the nation.

It has often been referred to and commented on as a matter of just pride and thankfulness that the exalted head of this great Empire has been, during her long reign, true to the simple statement made by her at its beginning, "I will be good." And her Royal Consort was justly called "Albert, the good." Thus the highest house in the land has been distinguished for purity and goodness, while the Queen herself is respected among all nations and peoples as an exemplary ruler, a true woman, a wise and prudent mother, and a tender and sympathising friend.

We do not worship great people, even though they be sovereigns, but it is a great advantage for a nation to have such good rulers. It tends to promote purity and peace, morality and order, respect for the laws and institutions of the country, and so contributes to the material wealth and moral power of a nation.

At the time of the Queen's accession, the feeling of loyalty to the throne and to monarchy had been very much weakened by the conduct and example of her predecessors, George III., George IV., and William IV. The first was mad, the second profligate, and the third a silly old man whose conduct at times deeply shamed his attendants and best friends. Had the example and conduct of the Sovereign still continued on the down grade, while education and the spirit of liberty tended upward, it is not improbable that before this England would either have become a Republic, or such a resolute attempt made to make it so, as might have rent the Empire in pieces, and deluged its fairest fields with blood. But the wise example of the ruling Sovereign during her long and prosperous reign has done much to popularise monarchy and strengthen the bonds of loyalty to the throne and the Constitution, and though the treasures and splendour of England's Royal House far surpass what Hezekiah possessed or dreamed of, they are held in humble dependence on the will of the Great Giver of all good.

"There is no place like home" for the practice of piety and the manifestation of the Christian spirit. To be "a saint abroad and a devil at home" is but a sorry caricature of Christianity.

Therefore let the claims of religion be fully recognised in the house, and let young and old practise the Apostolic injunction and "learn first to show piety at home." Let this be the centre from which its cheerful and happy glow shall spread to all around in ever-widening circles.

The angels of God visited the home of Abraham as he sat in his tent-door in the heat of the day, and his wife Sarah was busily occupied with her household duties. In order to serve God and live a Christian life it is not always necessary to put on one's Sunday clothes and sit down with our hands folded and the Bible on our knee. The rule is "whatsoever ye do, do all to the glory of God." Angels visited the abode of Manoah as he threshed wheat under an oak. They conversed with the wondering disciples as they looked after their ascending Lord. They visited the Apostles in prison and set them at liberty. They are not now seen by mortal eye, but they are still the ministers of God sent forth to minister to them who shall be the heirs of salvation. Waking or sleeping, they may be near us as they wing their flight amongst the numberless worlds of God's illimitable domain. They are the reporters, correspondents, and messengers of the Court of heaven.

What have they seen in thy house, and what have they heard there, and what reports have they borne to that upper world of purity and light? Have they seen God's word read and God's name honoured, His day sanctified and His throne visited, His cause provided for, and His message attended to, His friends loved and His ambassadors welcomed. Have they seen love and peace and harmony, and virtue, and order, and sobriety? Has the whole atmosphere of the place been such as Jesus would delight to dwell in, and where He would ever be a welcome guest? Or have they seen God's word neglected and God's name profaned, God's day desecrated and God's worship contemned? Instead of love and joy and peace, has there been envy and disorder and strife? Instead of prayer and praise, and humility and gratitude, have they seen carelessness and pride, haughtiness and forgetfulness of God? Instead of temperance and sobriety, have they seen indulgence and inebriety? In short, has self been remembered and God forgotten unless when necessity drove us to Him with our whining petitions in order to obtain further benefits for which we hardly deigned to thank Him? Have we been more eager to obtain gifts than to cultivate graces, to have our little wants supplied than to promote His glory?

Answer, what have these men seen in thy house, for assuredly they have seen and heard much though you have not seen them: ay, what indeed? How many thousands there are in these British Islands even who scarcely have houses in which to see anything. Their houses are not worthy the name of homes, and there is little to be seen in them except filth, and squalor, and ignorance, and misery. I refer now more particularly to the wretched homes and dens of the poor, and the lowest class, the submerged tenth, in the large cities and towns.

That some of these poor people make their homes what they are by drink and improvidence, and love to have it so, is little to the point. They are blameworthy surely, and reap as they sow, but blame is no remedy any more than "force." Prevention is better than cure. Can nothing more be done to prevent this?

So high an authority as the Archbishop of Canterbury has declared that the better housing of the poor is a great moral and religious question which the Church ought to face. A great question indeed it is, and a very difficult one too, but still not impossible of solution.

If, as the Vicar of Holy Trinity, Windsor (Rev. A. Robins), writes, the dwellings of the poor are still in the main moral death-traps, absolutely destructive of all real religion. If the slums of London and other large cities are, as they are acknowledged to be, a scandal to the civilisation and Christianity of this nineteenth century, and that too in the richest, most highly civilised and Christian nation in the world, then it seems full time that something additional should be done to abate the evil. and purify both the natural and moral atmosphere of such places. We send missionaries to the heathen in Africa and India and the islands of the sea. Justly indeed might some of those that we call heathen remind us of the duty of converting and elevating the heathen at home who live in ignorance and squalor, and some of whom know little more (if so much) of applied Christianity than the inhabitants of Central Africa.

This question which the prophet put to the king may very pertinently be asked now as regards (*a*), the house (*b*), the Church, and (*c*). the nation.

In the home will be seen much irreligion, ungodliness, and indifference. In the Church will be seen much coldness (or lukewarmness) and formalism, lawlessness and contention. In the nation, most civilised and Christian as it is, will be seen the most degrading squalor, ignorance, and poverty side by side with and under the shadow of the most profuse luxuriousness and splendour.

The gospel of dirt and ignorance on the one side, and the gospel of material comfort and excessive indulgence on the other. And while the nation spends £140,000,000 annually in pampering a degraded and degrading appetite for drink, the people give their "sham driblets" of shillings, sixpences, and pence to spread the knowledge of the Saviour whom they profess to love, which knowledge alone can elevate and save.

"Put away," said the Almighty to His ancient Church, "the evil of your doings, cease to do evil, learn to do well." Put away and cause to cease everything that is not fit for the All-seeing Eye to look upon. Put away every act and every word

that would taint the morals of the young and pure. Put away everything that would lend a sanction to sin or lead others to make light of it. Put away everything that would influence neighbours, and friends, and listeners, and onlookers to their hurt. Let your example tell on the side of religion, and

> "Whether losing, whether winning,
> Trust in God and do the right."

And, finally, "whatsoever things are true, whatsoever things are honest, whatsoever things are just, whatsoever things are pure, whatsoever things are lovely, whatsoever things are of good report," think on these things and practise them in your homes, for "the eyes of the Lord are in every place beholding the evil and the good." And "may the God of hope fill you with all joy and peace in believing, that ye may abound in hope through the power of the Holy Ghost." Amen.

OUR SEAMEN AS MISSIONARIES.

By the Rev. WILLIAM GUNTER, B.A., Rector of Abberton, Colchester.

Sermon Preached on behalf of the Missions to Seamen at Abberton, on December 23rd, 1892.

"They that go down to the sea in ships: and occupy their business in great waters; these men see the works of the Lord; and His wonders in the deep."—Psalm cvii. 23, 24. (Prayer-book Version).

IT might be thought that the Psalmist David considered that such men as are here described in this verse were a highly privileged class; that they enjoyed the peculiar favour of God, inasmuch as they, first of all, by the nature of their calling, were able to see the wonders of the deep, and then when in danger, by reason of storm and tempest, were delivered by the Lord out of their distress, and led safely into the haven where they would be. . . . And truly enough it is so in one sense. They do see the glories of the deep, and through the ever-changing marvels therein around them, are induced to fall down before their Maker in reverent adoration; and, also, so often are they delivered from danger, when all hope of being saved seems gone, that they intuitively pour out their praises "to Him for His goodness, and declare the wonders that He doeth for the children of men."

And how does this statement bear upon the subject of to-day, the Missions to Seamen, to the men who occupy their business in great waters, which we are asked to express our sympathy with and support?

Simply this, it encourages us still more to give the Mission the right hand of fellowship, for it shows us what a hopeful task the hand has been set to when it has such material to work upon Privileged truly by the nature of their surroundings, which brings them into such close intimacy with God; freed from the many cares and anxieties which choke up the pathway of life; of the many working men on shore, in cities, small towns and country villages; no politics, no commercial risks, no social jealousies, no domestic worries, no family cares to distract, weary, and disappoint, no petty religious rivalries, no pharasaical religious pride, no parody of religious godliness to sicken them with the very name of religion. Freed from all these things, which twist and turn the souls of so many of us from the simple path of love and duty, these men are privileged indeed, so much so that we might be led to think they required no help at our hands at all. But on reflection you will see that it is to such men that help would be most acceptable and most fruitful, for what are these privileges of theirs? Why, only the privilege of circumstances of opportunities, which they possess indeed above measure. It is the good ground outwardly that is theirs, not the shallow, not the stony or the thorny soil, which others, more mixed up with the excitements, the controversies, the competitions of life have to contend against, but the deep rich soil, freed from all such poisonous weeds and growths, out of which, if good seed be sown, will spring in due season fruit a hundredfold. And it is the knowing this that brings forward so many willing hearts and hands, not only in our sea-port towns, but in the more inland places, to furnish this help when the work of this particular mission is described and brought into notice.

As was said this morning our seamen are the largest and most influential body of men that this world possesses; missionaries, in spite of themselves; sometimes, be it confessed, missionaries of evil; though, it is to be hoped, now gradually as the years roll by, and as their minds become more and more and more opened to the truth as it is in Jesus, through the extension of Church teaching and through the instrumentality of such missions, as we are now speaking of, becoming missionaries of good and missionaries, too, unconsciously to themselves, inasmuch as it is not by preaching the Gospel news that they do their part towards drawing the heathen into the Gospel net; but it is by their Christianlike conduct in foreign ports, their peaceful behaviour, their kindly words and ways, their joyous though sober character amongst these heathen; they, in this way, recommend the Gospel which is being preached in those ports, by others whose particular business it is so to do.

It is in this mysterious way, brethren, the powerful influence that one mind, one life has over another, that God works to spread the knowledge of His will over the face of the whole earth, besides using the more organised methods of ordinary foreign missions; and, to this happy end, does the Mission to Seamen powerfully contribute,

by bringing home to our sailors, both at home and abroad, the word of God; applying it through many difficulties to their hearts and consciences, protecting them from many an evil design of the wicked; giving them homes and shelters wherever they may be on shore, when they otherwise would have nowhere, except in the dens of vice, to lay their heads; bringing to them in their gloomy, desponding, reckless moments, many a message of peace and comfort fresh from the fountain of God's Word; and, in this way, persuading them to become Christian men in walk and conversation, as well as in title and name.

It is to this work of the Society, in particular, that I have to draw your attention this evening.

First, who are the seamen here meant to whom the kind efforts of the Society are extended? They are of five classes.

First, the seamen of the merchant ships. More than half the ocean trade of the whole world is carried on in British ships. These ships, flying the British flag, now engaged in work, number 39,000, and are manned by 360,000 seamen. None of these ships carry chaplains, therefore these men are, for the most part, far away from the common opportunities of meeting for prayer and praise and spiritual instruction (means often sadly neglected by us at home where the opportunities are many and near at hand, but only too thankfully welcomed by seafaring folk in foreign parts). These men, therefore, have a special claim upon the Society, and the Society gladly and freely makes this claim their first charge.

Then comes the British Royal Navy with about 270 war-ships, of which number about 70 only of the largest carry chaplains, leaving 200 of the smaller smaller vessels without spiritual teaching, except that divine Service is by law obliged to be conducted on board such by the naval officer in command. And when at one of the naval ports, those who can be spared attend the dockyard chapel, or service on board the flag-ship. The chaplain of the Seamen's Mission visits, by permission, such of the Queen's vessels as these, and the Mission's lay readers are allowed to have free access to all men-of-war, men even in the largest ships, visiting them in their messes, where, being civilians and independent of the service, they are received and conversed with without any reserve by any of the petty officers and seamen who may be in difficulty and require advice.

And then there is the third class, the fishermen, bargemen, boatmen, numbering about 250,000, that are scattered round and about our coasts, ranging to Scotland and the Isle of Man, Ireland, and even the north of France. These are ministered to by the chaplains and readers of the Society. Once, again, there are the emigrants and all "who go down to the sea in ships"; steam yachts and sailing vessels are employed in the Thames and at Plymouth to take the chaplains to visit these at suitable times, and to hold farewell services on board the large emigrant ships at anchor in these roadsteads. Every year about 20,000 emigrants, chiefly for Australia, sail from the port of Plymouth alone.

And, lastly, there are the lighthouse and light-ship keepers, and inhabitants of the many tiny islets round our coast, who otherwise are without any pastoral aid whatever. These are visited by the chaplains in their vessels, who, if it were not for this Mission, would see no clergyman except on their periodical visits to their homes from year's end to year's end.

The work, so far mentioned, amongst these five classes of seafaring people, is of a spiritual nature; the gathering together for worship, the word of advice, private prayer, the interpretation of Scripture, counsel and consolation to souls in trouble and distress. But they undertake other work, too, amongst seamen, and work which, by many practical people, and by some friends of the Society, is even more appreciated than the direct spiritual work, and that is, the providing for the bodily comfort of those who need it, and rescuing them from much physical misery and degradation. In harbours, such as we know of in this neighbourhood, such as Brightlingsea, Mersea, and all other similar small outlets on the coast round England, this portion of the work is not much in demand, for the seamen of the vessels there belonging, for the most part live with their families and friends on shore, but in ports, and harbours, and roadsteads adjoining large towns, where vessels put in for a time either by stress of weather, or to land cargo, or for other reasons, places called "ports of call." This branch of the work is greatly appreciated, for the seamen on board these passing ships are perfect strangers on shore, without a friend to speak to, or to advise them where to seek shelter when they land, which shall be comfortable and respectable and safe; and there are hundreds of unprincipled and vicious people in these towns who know this only too well, and hungering after the poor seaman's hard-earned wages, stand waiting by the seashore, inviting every sailor as he lands to take up their temporary abode with them, promising him endless amusement, plenty of food and drink, and abundance of other delights, tempting enough to the unwary. The voice of the charmer is listened to, and for want of knowledge, often enough for want of friendly caution eagerly responded to, and the victim is lured into places of ill-repute only to come forth debased, miserable, conscience-stricken and beggared. To defend our seamen from these land-sharks this Society steps into the breach, builds homes near to the landing-places, where sailors may find bed, refreshment, reading-rooms, and a private room where they may consult the chaplain, write their letters, leave their wages in safety, or transmit them to their families; in short, where they may find all the homeliness,

comfort and attention, that is sought for and found in hotels by all fairly well-to-do people, when visiting places strange to them. In order to acquaint the seamen of the existence of such homes ready prepared for them, the agents of the Society present themselves on board the ships on dropping anchor, distribute cards setting forth the advantages offered, and personally converse with and try to persuade those men—who young and impulsive, may perhaps be thirsting to go their own way for a spell—to listen to reason, and use their liberty in a simple, wholesome and sober manner, and the result is that they send many a bright young seaman back to his ship at the end of his leave, rejoicing that he has been induced to put a curb on his natural hankerings, and to keep his character, person and purse, unharmed by passion and vice.

This, brethren, is one very important part of the Society's work, and in the small publications that have been placed in your seats you will find some account of the details of such work; how homes of this kind have been established in many of our seaport towns and docks at Liverpool, Bristol, London, Dublin, Cardiff, Southampton and so on, and they only wait for the increase of funds to extend such mission homes to every important port of call in the United Kingdom.

But, to continue, if such danger and temptation as has just been mentioned, luring the sailor to his ruin, has to be contended with in this our own Christian England, what are we to think of the danger awaiting him, when landing in a port in a foreign and perhaps a heathen and barbarous country, where ignorance of the language, ignorance of the manners and customs, ignorance of the outward garb of vice and crime, all contribute something to the trap laid for him, and to the success of the spoiler. The temptations there are multiplied a hundred-fold, so that in these places also the Society has planted its foot, and when our seamen now step on shore at Havre, Lisbon, Marseilles, Malta, Hong Kong, Yokohama, and other places, there they meet with these same guardian angels ready waiting to steer them safely through the quicksands of painted vice and gilded squalor, which, in reality, are but the portals of hopeless misery, to the same kind of friendly shelter and comfort they enjoyed in their own country at home.

Truly many a man has cause to bless the efforts made for him by Christian people, with not only the means to give, but with willing hearts of sympathy to induce them to support a Society whose aim it is to lessen the friendless lot of the sailor in foreign parts; and many a lonely woman too at home has reason to feel thankful for such efforts, for by means of them she knows the protection her well-loved husband or son enjoys, although so far away from his family and home.

I need say no more, brethren, as to the benefits conferred by this Society upon seafaring men, and not only upon them, but therefore also upon their families and friends; and, in fact, there is no time now to enlarge more upon them, or I might go on to speak of other points of very great interest in connection with the same subject. I should like to tell of the spread of Bibles, Prayer and Hymn-books, and publications of a lighter kind, all tending though to elevate the hopes and lives of those who read them, which is effected by the Society. The comfort of many a friendly word spoken to the lonesome lighthouse-keepers and dwellers in light-ships, who are literally and continually "rocked in the cradle of the deep." The visits of the Mission vessels to such as these, in their solitary watches, are truly the visits of angels, though like all angels' visits necessarily few and far between. One might speak more fully of the indirect result of all this Christianizing care over our seamen. The fashioning of them, as was said before, into a huge army of foreign missionaries, becoming such, unconsciously, by showing forth the truth, the manliness, the beauty of the Christian life wherever they might be, but quite sufficient has been said to explain the great importance of the Society's aim and purpose, and the practical shape into which that purpose has been put.

The question naturally remains, Can any one help sympathising with such a work? We cannot all join in it, perhaps; in fact it has been mentioned quite lately in regard to this appeal that in such poor parishes as ours away from the more busy scenes of sea-life that "charity ought to be begun at home," that we have nothing to spare for help outside. Perhaps it may be so, though the welfare of our sailors is not quite so unconnected with us personally as is sometimes thought. And this you will see at once when I remind you that, in the mere matter of our food supply, apart from the vegetables which we grow in our gardens, there is not in these days a single article of food, which as a nation we can procure, except through the instrumentality of our sailor men, though it would take too long now to prove the same and give the reason why.

But, in any case, here we have the Society's work spread out before us, and we are asked to think of it in all its bearings. We cannot help feeling kindly towards it; we can all pray for its welfare, and those who can do so will gladly help towards the extension of its blessings.

And this is to have the true spirit of Christianity not only to bask ourselves in the light of God's truth, but to help in spreading this light around us until the warmth of its rays reach unto the ends of the world.

THE Ecclesiastical Commissioners have made a grant of £700 to meet the sum of £1,000 privately subscribed towards erecting a vicarage for St. Chad's parish, Shrewsbury.

CHRIST AND OTHER-WORLDLINESS.

By the Rev. W. A. CUTTING, Vicar of Gayton, King's Lynn.

Sermon Preached from the Gospel on Septuagesima Sunday, 1893.

"So the last shall be first, and the first last; for many be called, but few chosen."—Matt. xx. 16.

WITH a parable, even as with a picture, it is the right view-point that is important. We have to catch the right light upon it, else, looking on the picture, you may see the streaks of paint or the varnish, perhaps, but not the picture.

This is particularly the case with the parable of the Labourers in the Vineyard. A rustic hearer or reader, who should fasten upon the penny-a-day wage, might be so taken up with the idea of absurd inadequacy as to have neither eye nor ear for anything else in the narration. The preacher has known seafarers so caught with this or that, by translators, misunderstood and misrendered nautical term in Acts xxvii., as to be unimpressed by the rest of that wonderful account of peril and providential escape. Not to say that "the penny" was nearer our shilling than our penny, so-called, it is the purchasing power of money that is in question, and this has varied immensely between ancient and modern times, even as it still varies between different parts of the world at the present day. "In the reign of our third Edward (nearly 600 years ago) wages were a penny a day for field work; but then wheat was only 40d. the quarter, a sheep 14d., etc."* Again, the course pursued by the master in verses 10 to 14 would in these days be answered by a strike; while, in the rising tide of Socialism, verse 15 might evoke even scorn; for "it is as strong an indirect sanction of the principle of ownership as we can imagine any writer giving."† Yet, again, nothing is more common or popular than to seize on the eleventh hour in this parable, as if it encouraged putting off repentance to a death-bed; whereas those engaged not till the eleventh hour can plead, "No man had hired them" earlier. How many souls on a death-bed can say they never had the call before? And if verse 6 and verse 9 countenance late repentance, then, by the same token, verse 1 discountenances early piety, for certainly those called and going to work "early in the morning" were discredited in the end.

All this comes of not having got the right light on the parable. Now note two items. First, its occasion (ἀφορμή), in xix. 27. Next, that it starts from and leads back to the very like words about "the first" and "the last" in xix. 30, and xx. 16.

The occasion is a question by Simon Peter, savouring of the spirit of bargain: "Behold, we have left all, and followed Thee: what shall we have therefore?" "Verily," says our Lord in effect, "thou and all such will have your reward. But, be warned, many that are first shall be last, and the last first." Then He proceeds: "For the kingdom of heaven is like," and so on, through the Labourers in the Vineyard, as far as verse 16: "So the last shall be first, and the first last; for many be called, but few chosen."

Some will follow us if we say it is as a theorem, of which xix. 30 is the proposition, xx. 1-15 the proof, and verse 16 the Q. E. D.

The first become last because they seek to bargain; the last get first, because they have no bargaining ground to go upon.

It will be noticed that the parable has its primary application to Jews and Gentiles. Our Lord's answer to St. Peter's question is made to him as a Jew. He and those with him "who had first trusted in Christ," "in the regeneration should sit on twelve thrones, judging the twelve tribes of Israel" (xix. 28). But in process of time St. Peter himself, however reluctantly, and after the removal of whatever prejudices, should "open the door of faith to the Gentiles." "The drift of the parable is to intimate that those who had never passed through the training of Judaism were to be as welcome to the gifts of God in Christ. This is its chief bearing; but none the less it teaches the lesson that God, who promises and keeps His promise to one, may give much more than He has promised to another, without being open to the charge of injustice."* As between Jews and Gentiles, for a case in point, St. Paul's uniform language is that "Christ was the minster of the circumcision for the truth of God, to confirm the promises made unto the Fathers; and that the Gentiles should glorify God for His mercy." With this parable also compare Rom. ix. 30 to 32: "What shall we say then? That the Gentiles, which followed not after righteousness, have attained unto righteousness, even the righteousness which is of faith. But Israel, which followed after righteousness, hath not attained to the law of righteousness. Wherefore? Because they sought it not by faith."

But, in its Christian application, its application to ourselves, I read this parable as a caution against a bargaining spirit in the things of God.

A good deal of popular Christianity has been hit-off as "other-worldliness," that is, a bargain for the next world in a spirit which does not indeed recognise itself, but which is not so very different essentially from that in which men live for this world.

"How many," once said a Scotch country preacher, "regard religion itself simply as the means of getting to heaven, instead of that which

* Dr. Brewer.

† *Spectator*, "Christian Socialism," December, 1883.

* *Spectator*, "Christian Socialism," December, 1883.

fits them for it! How few think that the end of religion is character, and not merely happiness!"

So all truly evangelical, spiritual, experimental religion is against the bargaining spirit from first to last. How does the sinner come to Christ at the first?

"Just as he is, without one plea."

"Nothing in my hand I bring;
Simply to Thy Cross I cling."

He does not ask to be accepted and forgiven, because "he is not as other men are;" to do this were to be rejected. But his cry is, "God be merciful to me a sinner"; and he "goes down to his house justified." It is a law of the kingdom, "He fills the hungry with good things, and the rich He sends empty away."

"When St. Paul represents sin and God in the two great masters whom we may serve, he speaks of the "wages" which sin pays to its servants, but refuses to speak of the wages which God might pay. He changes the word, and calls it a "gift." If you could, as it were, pay in part even, it would prevent you from seeing the depth of God's love in free and full forgiveness; for you would always consider you had more or less earned it, and it would keep you out of peace, for you would never feel sure you had done enough. To think to accept from God in the spirit of bargain and traffic that which He offers only of His kingly grace is even blasphemy.* In the Collect, "For our evil deeds we worthily deserve to be punished," "by the comfort of God's grace" we pray to be "mercifully relieved."

And then when you have so come and been accepted, you must go on as you have begun. You did not make terms before you came, and you must not make terms now. Did ever mortal man attempt terms with his Maker? Well, that keen dealer, Jacob, the same who had driven such a hard bargain with his brother for the birthright, and afterwards dealt so shrewdly with Laban, he says, "If God will be with me, and will keep, and feed, and bring me safely back . . . . of all that Thou shalt give me, I will surely give a tenth unto Thee." Many a Christian, indeed, would do well if he did vow and perform to God as much as this; and Jacob shall rise up with him in the judgment, and shall condemn him. For what were his dawn to our day, his twilight to our noontide?

But there must be no such "if" in our religious life. A Hindoo poet would say:

"It is
In action only that a man attains
Immunity from action. Yet, in working,
Ne'er work for recompense; let the act's motive
Be in the act itself." †

And if a heathen could see that, how much more we who sing:

"We ask no other wages,
When Thou shalt call us home;
But to have shared the travail,
That makes Thy kingdom come!"

I believe these lines just hit off the point and spirit of our parable. The "last," who never think of bargaining, who know they have no ground to go upon, we "first"; the "first," if and because they bargain, we "last."

The Epistle for the day, about the Christian race and the incorruptible crown, just bears this out, for it shows that while "there is a reward for the righteous," it is of the nature not of wages, but of a prize. Prizes are freely offered and given: to get one is an honour; wages are a right and a necessity, but not an honour. The servants get wages, but the children prizes. The "inheritor of the kingdom of heaven" is also "the child of God." "Now then, thou art no more a servant, but a son," is God's word to every Christian soul: "The servant abideth not in the house for ever, but the son abideth ever." And when the servant goes up to the house for his wages, the son, who may have worked by his side in the same field at the same work, even wearing the like dress, shall go into the house, free of the house, free of "all that his father has."

"If life be long, I will be glad
That I may long obey;
If short, what labourer is sad
To end his toilful day?"

THE enthronement of Dr. G. H. Wilkinson as Bishop of St. Andrews is fixed for the 27th inst., in St. Ninian's Cathedral, Perth.

THE Ecclesiastical Commissioners have made a grant of £400, to meet a benefaction of like amount, towards defraying the cost of a parsonage for Bettws-y-Coed, Carnarvonshire.

SUGGESTIVE HINTS FOR TEACHERS AND WORKERS. —The Resurrection of Christ: Read Matt. xxviii. 1, 10. —The Resurrection of our Lord and Saviour is one of the greatest fundamental foundation pillars on which Christianity rests; had not Christ rose again from the grave, the whole scheme and structure of the Christian faith would necessarily have come to nought; we should, as the great apostle of the Gentiles presents it to us, have our faith in vain, and be yet in our sins. But there is nothing in connection with the Christian faith that demonstrates its vivacity so well as the resurrection of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ, therefore the Christian's hope is more than mere human authority. But its testimony is demonstrated unmistakably by infinite veracity, we notice a few lessons of practical importance:—1. Jesus stated His authority. 2. Jesus promised our complete redemption by His death. 3. Jesus' predictions of Himself were verified. 4. Jesus' resurrection proved His Divinity. 5. Jesus' resurrection fills us with hope. 6. Jesus' resurrection the hope and joy of the Christian. "Now is Christ risen from the dead, and become the first fruits of them that slept" (1 Cor. xv. 20).

---

* In substance from "Is it Peace?" by Rev. J. Allan Whitworth; quoted with the more pleasure that it comes from All Saints, Margaret-street.

† From a Hindu classic; quoted in Prof. Monier Williams' "Hinduism," p. 218. S.P.C.K.

NOTICES.

All communications respecting the Literary portion of the paper should be addressed to the Editor.

Business communications of every kind should be addressed to Mr. S. GIBBON, at the CHURCH OF ENGLAND PULPIT Office, 160, Fleet Street, London, E.C., to whom cheques and Post-office orders for subscriptions (in advance), three months, 2s., six months, 3s. 6d., twelve months, 6s. 6d., are to be made payable.

The Cases for binding Vol. XXXIV. are now ready.

FOR HEALTH AND IMMORTALITY.

The Ecclesiastical Review.

SATURDAY, APRIL 8, 1893.

THE HOLIDAYS.

THE Easter holidays have come and gone. How much are we the better for them? The hard-worked Member of Parliament would give a crooked (or perhaps unduly straight) answer to that cross question. Thanks to Mr. Gladstone the House of Commons is not much better for its very brief holiday. That astute old hand, foiled in his efforts to rush through the second reading of the Home Rule Bill before Easter, has curtailed the time his opponents intended to spend in showing him up. By cutting short the recess in the most unprecedented fashion, he has hoped to keep the eyes of the people at least half-closed until he has committed them to his schemes. We think he has over-reached himself. The spectacle presented last Thursday week of the Prime Minister quarrelling with the House, and carrying his resolutions entirely by the help of those models of subservience, the Irish members, cannot have commended itself to any right-minded Gladstonian (we trust there are some left). Even Gladstonian M.P.'s like holidays, have occasional engagements, possess family ties, and the sacrifice of all this, especially at the bidding of the party least respected and least worthy of respect, cannot enhance the reputation and increase the influence of their chief. We may safely infer that the Gladstonians have spent their brief recess in no very blissful enjoyment of the present, nor hopeful anticipation of the future.

On the other hand, Unionists have made the most of the short space allotted to them. England has not been behind Ireland in vigorously protesting against the measure which we are assured fulfils the fondest and deepest aspirations of both countries. The Easter holiday has been long enough for a very decisive utterance to be made on both sides of St. George's Channel, which will probably echo in the House of Commons. In vain do we ask for any signs or enthusiasm on the other side of the question. While Unionists are loudly proclaiming their loyalty, and their intention to devote to it their time, their money, and if need be their lives, their opponents maintain a silence discreet perhaps, but not impressive. We have long heard that speech was given to conceal thought; but surely it is a novel corollary that a nation's will is best shown by its silence.

So much for the political aspect of the Easter holiday of 1893. It is pleasant to record perhaps the finest holiday opportunities there have been for years. At least the weather has spoiled nobody's holiday. From all parts of England the reports are the same. Throughout its course March retained a lamb-like aspect, and April has so far followed its example. Railway and steamboat companies have broken all records, and every sort of machinery for making people enjoy themselves has been strained almost to breaking point. We can only hope that the money and labour has been well spent, and that the wild crush and the intense discomfort of wholesale holiday-making has proved full of compensation in the way of clearer brains, fitter limbs, and browner faces.

SIR E. HORNBY ON INTERNATIONAL ARBITRATION.

AN interesting essay by Sir Edmund Hornby, on the formation of an International Court of Arbitration, has been published by the Peace Society, 47, New Broad-street, London, E.C. The author has had long and extensive diplomatic experience, having been a Judge of the Supreme Consular Court of the Levant, and also Judge of the Supreme Court of China and Japan. In a letter to Dr. Wm. E. Darby, Secretary of the Peace Society, Sir Edmund Hornby says, in forwarding his essay: "The subject is to me a most interesting one. Throughout my career, I have had a great deal to do with international questions, arbitrations, etc., and I am convinced that Governments would, far more easily than is imagined, refer matters, often in their inception, easy of settlement, to a Tribunal, if one existed, so constituted as to ensure impartial judgments, based on recognised principles. It must, however, be beyond the reach of suspicion, and also be of the highest rank and influence. The smaller States would welcome it as a Protectorate; the larger ones would soon come round. I have reason to hope that the Emperor of Germany would welcome it. In talking the matter over with two distinguished Ministers, one a French, man and the other a Russian, they both said they

dreaded reference for arbitration to Sovereigns and Commissions, because it was impossible to calculate or foresee the influence of 'interests,' political, diplomatic, or private ; but that if a Tribunal could be constituted of international weight, above all suspicion, and that would act on 'principle,' their objections would disappear."

In his essay Sir Edmund proposes the creation, by the combined Powers, of a really able and impartial permanent body of Arbitrators. They should be about twenty in number, selected from the foremost jurists and statesmen, with the dignity of senators, and inferior in rank only to reigning Sovereigns, and to be absolved for life from all allegiance to any Sovereign, but to be prohibited from receiving any gift or honours. Their appointment should be at least for ten years with a salary not less than £10,000 per annum, and a retiring pension of £3,000. There should be a chief secretary, with a salary of £5,000. A splendid central Arbitral College, or Court, with spacious grounds, should be erected in some convenient and comparatively neutral position. The total cost of the whole College and its staff of Arbitrators would probably not exceed two million pounds, or much less than the cost of a single small war.

As to the carrying out of the arbitral decisions, it is pointed out that, even at present, with very defective arrangements for securing entire impartiality, the nations who refer their disputes to Arbiters almost invariably abide by their decisions. Then still more weight would attach to a thoroughly impartial and competent College of Arbitrators. Their decisions, too, would gradually form a body of practical international law, adapted to modern circumstances, which, as Sir Edmund points out, is a characteristic defect in the international law of the past.

THE Duke of Westminster has given £100 towards the cost of sending to every clergyman in the kingdom a copy of the first number of *Temporal Welfare*, the organ of the Church of England Sanitary Association.

MR. JOHN FOTHERGILL, of Brownber, Cumberland, having given £1,000 towards the endowment of St. Aidin's District Church, Ravenstonedale, the governors of Queen Anne's Bounty have made a further grant of £400.

THE Bishop of Rochester, who recently, under the Clergy Discipline Act, deprived the vicar of Stoke, near Rochester, of his living, has signified his intention of defraying the whole of the defendant's costs out of his own pocket.

IMMEDIATELY before the Bishop of British Columbia's consecration at Westminster Abbey on Saturday week, an episcopal ring, subscribed for by the clergy of the rural deanery of Southampton, was presented to Dr. Perrin, in the Jerusalem Chamber, by Canon Wilberforce, in the names of the subscribers. The ring, which is lozenge-shaped and in massive gold, with the arms of the see engraved on an amethyst, is the work of Mr. Wyon, of Regent Street.

Reviews and Notices.

"MARRIAGE AND THE RELATION OF THE SEXES." An Address to Women by the Marquis of Queensberry. London : Watts & Co., 17, Johnson's Court, E.C. Pp. 28. 1893.

THIS is a logical and well thought-out essay designed to suppress the enormous physical, moral, and social evils of prostitution. There is no denying that prostitution and promiscuous intercourse of the sexes is, and always has been, the bane of Christian and monogamous countries. We can fully bear his lordship out that this is not the case where polygamy is sanctioned and legalised. His lordship only speaks the bare and naked truth when he describes prostitution as a secret, dangerous, and criminal form of polygamy ; and that one way of rendering it innocuous and holy, in fact of Christianising it, is by regulating and giving it a legal sanction.

This same remedy was very ably urged about the year 1780 by Mr. Madan, a chaplain of the London Lock Hospital, in a book called "Thelyphthora" (*i.e.*, the corruption of women). For this noble Christian exposition George III. asked the Bishop to unfrock him. For more recently propounding the same remedy in a book styled "Hagar" (Wertheimer, Lea & Co.) the late Bishop of London withdrew his license from the author, a late chaplain to the Westminster Hospital. Mr. Madan was saved by the beautiful hymns that he had composed for the Church. We trust that specimens of such intolerance will never more be exhibited. We commend the careful study of these two books as well as the Marquis of Queensberry's address to all women, doctors, clergymen and others interested in the moral and physical health of our population. Women are personally most interested in the question, and it is for them to decide which entails upon them the greatest amount of suffering the disease, prostitution, or its proposed remedy, a legalised and regulated polygamy. This we take to be the Marquis's meaning, although from deference to woman's physiological nature he would restrict and perhaps render his remedy in a measure abortive by limiting the sexual relationship to one woman at a time, and call it plural marriage.

According to our experience, which is endorsed by Shakespeare, woman's nature is strictly monogamous ; she can only really love one man, whereas man's nature is polygamous, and he can really love more than one woman. This we believe is the general rule ; of course there may be exceptions. Most women desire to have children, and we have heard a few unmarried ladies say that they would rather have a half share in a husband than none at all.

If their legitimate and natural desire is to be fulfilled in this country, where there are 1,000,000 more marriageable women than men, it must be done by legal or illegal concubinage or polygamy. The argument against polygamy so often pressed by women and clergymen, that nearly an equal number of males and females are born into the world and arrive at puberty is fallacious. In order to be valid, the sexual desires and functions of men and women ought to be identical and synchronous ; but they are not. A woman is able to bear children only for about thirty years, whereas a man can procreate them during sixty or seventy years of his life.

The education and bringing up of children is a great safeguard to the morality, strength, and wellbeing of

the nation. We have no fear of over-population, or sympathy with the unnatural and unchristian doctrines of Malthus. The more we see of society, we think, with the Psalmist, that those men and women are the happiest who have most children. If the women would consent to some form of plural marriage being legalised, it would prevent a vast amount of horrible crimes, and in many instances preclude the necessity of divorce. Polyandry for married women is adultery, unnatural, unscriptural, and, if ever practised, would exterminate the race. It is avowedly loathed and hated by the *demi-monde* itself.

The noble Marquis has done good service to morality, and we trust that the seed he has sown may fructify and diminish the enormous evils of prostitution. His remedy would be effectual, but will take some generations to make it available.

Meanwhile we trust to circumcision, police control, and female emigration being promoted, if not enforced, in order to prevent disease and diminish the vast number of open and clandestine harlots in our large towns. We hope that the study of physiology in our primary, secondary and public schools will endow the public with a fuller and better knowledge of the relation of the sexes, and so prevent the spread of *hereditary disease*, which is the great demoraliser of our race. The highest and holiest moral precept was given when the Son of Righteousness bade His disciples to "Heal the sick and cleanse the lepers."

CORRESPONDENCE.

To the Editor of the CHURCH OF ENGLAND PULPIT AND ECCLESIASTICAL REVIEW.

FALSE DOCTRINE, HERESY, AND SCHISM.

SIR,—I cannot accept Mr. Murphy's apology for the word "heresy" being perverted from its Scriptural and proper and original meaning of a "sect," or the "making of a sect," into its present ecclesiastical sense of "false doctrine." He thinks we can dispense with the word "heresy," and lend it, or give it away, to those who want it for another purpose, because (1), "The Scriptural sense of the word is merely schism," and (2), "We do not need a synonym for schism, and unhappily we do need a word for 'heresy in the ecclesiastical sense.'"

I demur to both these statements. (1.) It is not true, I believe, that "the Scriptural sense of the word 'heresy' is merely schism." There is an important difference between the two words. This is plain from 1 Cor. xi. 18, 19, where St. Paul speaks of "schisms" existing among the Corinthians, and predicts that there would be "heresies" also among them. Schism is heresy in the germ or the bud; heresy is the fully developed flower, or the ripened fruit. With all their schisms the saints at Corinth still came together into one place for Holy Communion. There were as yet no open separations, no heresies, among them, as Paul knew there would be, and as there were. Schism and heresy are distinct, though connected. If one was a synonym for the other, we would not find them mentioned separately in the one short sentence, as they are in 1 Cor. xi. 19, 20, and as they occur in our Litany, "From all false doctrine, heresy, and schism . . . . . Good Lord, deliver us." The three evil things are there kept as distinct one from another as they are in the New Testament. They correspond in the way of opposition to "truth, unity, and concord"—truth being the opposite to false doctrine, unity the opposite to heresy, and concord the opposite to schism.

(2.) We do not, I believe, "need a word for 'heresy in the ecclesiastical sense.'" "Heterodoxy" is ready and waiting to be used. It is nearly as short and quite as handy a word as "heresy," and quite as sharp and heavy a stone to fling at a Pelagian, a Calvinist, or an Arminian. Besides, it comes to our hand with the recommendation of being the exact opposite of "orthodoxy."

I do not know what Mr. Murphy includes in his notion of Calvinism as "an entire system of perverted doctrine;" but remembering that Augustine, Hooker, Chalmers, etc., were as Calvinistic as Calvin himself, I can hardly think that the religion of those "lights and ornaments of the Church of Christ" was "heresy in its ecclesiastical sense"—supposing that *were* its ecclesiastical sense, which I doubt, "of an entire system of perverted doctrine." Nor do I see how a man can "hold heretical doctrine without being himself a heretic." It sounds like a contradiction in terms to say so.

I spoke, in the PULPIT of March 18th, of the misuse of the word "heresy" as having been attended "with very disastrous effect." I had in mind the disgraceful multiplication of sects, especially among Protestant, Bible-reading Christians. I feel sure this would never have taken place to anything like the same extent if they had understood that a "sect" is a "heresy," and had remembered that heresy, or sect-making, is condemned in the New Testament as one of the works of the flesh.

W. T. HOBSON.

St. Barnabas Vicarage, Douglas,
March 31st, 1893.

PREFERMENTS AND APPOINTMENTS.

Allin, Rev. William, M.A.; Rector of Romsley, Worcestershire.
Blosse, Rev. Robert Charles Lynch, M.A., Curate; Vicar of Stinchcombe, Gloucestershire.
Brandreth, Rev. Henry, M.A., Rector of Dickleburgh, Scole, Norfolk; Vicar of St. Edward's, Cambridge.
Christie, Rev. J. J., M.A., Vicar of Pontefract; Rural Dean of Pontefract.
Condell, Rev. Thomas Edward Guard, Curate of St. Alkmund's, Derby; Curate-in-Charge of Monamolin, Wexford.
Curwen, Rev. A. J. G., B.D., Rector of Dufton; Rector of Kirkby Thore, Westmoreland.
Doudney, Rev. Edward P., M.A., Curate-in-Charge of St. George's, in the Parish of St. Saviour's, Nottingham; Rector of All Saints', Wainfleet, Lincolnshire.
Firth, Rev. W. W. D., Secretary of the Additional Curates Society for the North of England; Vicar of Christ Church, Patricroft, Manchester.
Hodgson, Rev. Francis Henry, M.A., Vicar of Abbotts Langley; Rector of Little Gaddesden, Herts.
Hopkins, Rev. Evan H., Vicar of Holy Trinity, Richmond, Surrey; Vicar of St. Luke's, Ratcliffe-square, South Kensington.
Hughes, Rev. Arthur J. I., Curate of St. Thomas's, Halliwell; Curate-in-Charge of Dudley and Annitsford, in the Parish of Killingworth, near Newcastle-on-Tyne.
Hume, Rev. Henry Sykes, M.A., Rector of Staple-Fitzpaine, Taunton; Vicar of St. John's, Lowestoft.
Hunt, Rev. A. E., M.A., Vicar of Attleborough, Warwickshire.
Huntsman, Rev. Edmund John, M.A., Vicar of Harworth; Chaplain to the Sheriff of Notts (Mr. G. J. Whitaker).
Jenkins, Rev. David; Chaplain to the High Sheriff of Carnarvonshire (Mr. Charles Frost).
Job, Rev. Charles, R., M.A., Vicar of Newington, Hull; Vicar of Hampton-hill, Middlesex.

Jones, Rev. Charles, B.A., Curate; Vicar of All Saints', Habergham, Lancashire.
Keble, Rev. Thomas, M.A., Vicar of Bisley and Rural Dean; Honorary Canon in Gloucester Cathedral.
Lang, Rev. Algernon Hermann, M.A.; Six Preacher in Canterbury Cathedral.
Lindsay, Rev. Thomas E., M.A., Curate of Doncaster; Vicar of St. Paul's, Middlesbrough.
Lipscomb, Rev. Charles Henry, Rector of Howe-with Little Poringland, Norfolk; Surrogate for the Diocese of Norwich.
Macnamara, Rev. H. D., M.A, Rector of St. James's, Garlickhithe, with St. Michael's, Queenhithe, and Holy Trinity-the-Less, in the City of London; Honorary Minor Canon of St. Paul's Cathedral.
Macpherson, Rev- Ewen George Fitzroy, B.A.; Chaplain to the Forces, Fourth Class.
Moon, Rev. J. E.; Vicar of St. Chrysostom, Birmingham.
Mosse, Rev. William G., M.A.; Vicar of the Lickey, Bromsgrove.
Murray, Rev. John, M.A., Rector of Rugby; Rural Dean of Rugby.
Murray, Rev. William, B.A., Curate of Church Gresley; Curate-in-Charge of the New Mission District in the Parish of Whittington.
Overton, Rev. Frederick Arnold, M.A., Curate of Headington, Oxon; Vicar of High Cross, Herts.
Perry, Rev. G. H., Vicar of St. Matthew's, City-road; Assistant Diocesan Inspector in the London Diocese.
Pollock, Rev. Bertram, M.A., Assistant-Master of Marlborough College; Head Master of Wellington College.
Raupert, Rev. J. G. F.; Incumbent of the Octagon Chapel, Bath.
Reed, Rev. Samuel, M.A., Rector of Llanerfyl, near Welshpool; Chaplain to the High Sheriff of Montgomeryshire (Mr. Hilton).
Richardson, Rev. George Frederick, M.A., Rector of Saxmundham, Suffolk; Surrogate for the Diocese of Norwich.
Rose, Rev. Percy Wollaston, M.A.; Vicar of Norton, Northamptonshire.
Smith, Rev. Ernest F. H.; Chaplain and Naval Instructor to the *Tourmaline*.
Soden, Rev. James Newton, Curate of Bath Abbey Church; Chaplain of Trinity Church, Pau.
Stephens, Rev. David, Curate-in-Charge of St. Catherine's, Colwyn; Chaplain to the High Sheriff of Carnarvon.
Thornton, Rev. Robinson, D.D., Vicar of St. John's, Nottinghill, and Prebendary of Chiswick in St. Paul's Cathedral; Archdeacon of Middlesex.
Turner, Rev. C. H., M.A., Rector of St. George's-in-the-East; Prebendary of St. Paul's Cathedral.
Ward, Rev. Richard, Vicar of St. George's, Newcastle-under-Lyme; Rural Dean of Newcastle.
Webb-Peploe, Rev. H. W., M.A., Vicar of St. Paul's, Onslow-square; Prebendary of St. Paul's Cathedral.
Wilson, Rev. Hugh Townshend, M.A., Curate of St. Mary's, Chelmsford; Rector of Widford, near Chelmsford.
Wonnacott, Rev. W. J. B., M.A., Curate of All Saints', Lewes; Vicar of Southbourne, Sussex.

CLERICAL OBITUARY.

Anderson, Rev. Charles, at St. John's Vicarage, on the 26th ult., aged 67.
Barlow, Rev. Robert Hilaro, M.A., formerly Vicar of Childswickham, at Avenue House, Stratford-on-Avon, on the 23rd ult., aged 48.
Bruhl, Rev. John Henry, for forty years connected with the London Society for the Promotion of Christianity among the Jews, at South Hackney, on the 31st ult., aged 69.
De Cerjat, Rev. H. S., for fifty-two years Rector of the parish, at West Horsley Rectory, Leatherhead, on the 27th ult., aged 79.
Pain, Rev. J. L., M.A., Vicar, at Silverdale Vicarage, on the 27th ult., aged 60.
Pearson, Rev. Frederick Thorpe, M.A., Vicar of St. George's, Whitwick, on the 2nd inst., aged 71.
Powell, Rev. Richmond, Rector of Southstoke, at Southstoke Rectory, Arundel, on the 28th ult., aged 85.
Shortt, Rev. Edward, M.A., at Woodhorn Vicarage, on the 29th ult., aged 64.

FIRST REMOVE THE CAUSE.

MEN frequently worry and trouble themselves a great deal in trying to cure the symptoms of vital weakness' nervous exhaustion, and kindred ailments, instead of endeavouring to first remove the cause. This can be done by Mr. Harness' Electropathic Treatment without the aid of drugs. It is useless to tell sufferers to employ their minds and bodies in useful work and to forget their disorders, so long as the cause of their troubles is not removed. How can it be expected that when they are fatigued by the least exertion they can occupy themselves by studying, walking, or other exercise? Even in conversation they frequently lose the thread of it and repeatedly find their memory failing them. What can they do? Physic will not cure them—perhaps the leading physicians have failed to afford them any relief, and they have consequently become hopeless. It is to such as these that Mr. Harness' new combined Electropathic Belt and Suspensory is so strongly recommended, as, by its gentle but continuous action, invigorating electric currents are imperceptibly generated and conveyed direct from the spinal cord to the affected parts. It is this scientifically constructed and convenient appliance which silently but surely acts upon the vital organs, and removes the cause of the patient's disease, effecting a wonderful change in his health, character, and conduct, and speedily enabling him to return to his natural tastes and habits, and enjoy once more the full vigour of youth, with all its accompanying pleasures.

We may add that this perfect Electro-medical appliance is exceedingly comfortable to wear, gives wonderful support and vitality to all the internal organs of the body, prevents chills, imparts new life and vigour to the debilitated constitution, stimulates the organic action, promotes the circulation, assists digestion, and promptly renews that vital energy, the loss of which is the first symptom of decay. Its healing properties are multifarious. It stimulates the functions of various organs, increases their secretions, gives tone to muscle and nerves, relaxes morbid contractions, improves nutrition, and effectually renews exhausted nerve force. Acting directly on the system, it sustains and assists its various functions, and thus promotes the health and vigour of the entire frame. Besides these benefits, the mind is maintained in a buoyant, cheerful state, and every faculty is stimulated to the highest condition of intellectual strength.

Gentlemen who read the above announcement have only to visit London and call at the Electropathic and Zander Institute (52, Oxford Street, W.) to be convinced of the marvellous curative powers of Electricity and Mr. Harness' perfect methods of imperceptibly applying the current. The medical officers of the establishment are in daily attendance, and may be consulted free of charge either personally or by letter.

The Church of England Pulpit.

CHRIST THE WAY.

By Ven. W. M. SINCLAIR, D.D., Archdeacon of London, Canon of St. Paul's, and Hon. Chaplain to H.M. the Queen.

Sermon Preached in St. Paul's Cathedral on Sunday, March 12th, 1893.

"I am the way."—John xiv. 6.

IN estimating the drift and bearing of the words of our Lord, we cannot be too careful to weigh them accurately. Here, for instance, Christ is the way, not merely because He pointed it out. If we took such an explanation we should depart both from the expression and the figure. We should not be paying attention to the facts of His life, and the position which they occupy with regard to the Word of God both in the Old and New Testament. He is the Way because in His personal manifestation the true mediation for eternal salvation, the communication between the seen and the unseen, is actually given. It is just as we sing in the *Te Deum:* "When Thou hadst overcome the sharpness of death, Thou didst open the kingdom of heaven to all believers." By what Christ was and what Christ did, man was placed in a new position. Something that He did was absolutely the sole way of approach to God for all men. It would be for men to take advantage of that change in their condition which He wrought for them. They would take advantage of it by their personal attitude of trust towards Him, which we call faith. If a man is aiming at a goal, even if the road has been made for him, he must avail himself of it, pursue it, use it for himself; but the way has been prepared for him by another's hand. For us the means of acceptance with the Almighty is the Person of the Lord Jesus Christ through the great act of redemption which He perfected. "Who for us men and for our salvation came down from heaven, and was incarnate by the Holy Ghost of the Virgin Mary, and was made man; and was crucified also for us under Pontius Pilate. He suffered and was buried."

There is a great temptation to the human intellect to explain away the Atoning Sacrifice. It always has been so. "The preaching of the cross is to them that perish foolishness; but unto us which are saved it is the power of God." There are two main lines of thought which try to represent the Apostles' view of the Atonement as only a temporary Hebrew phase of opinion, clothing a mere philosophical truth in an accidental dress. One attributes to the death of our Lord its chief value for us as the highest type of self-sacrifice; the other looks to the Incarnation itself as the chief end of our Lord's manifestation on earth, in which the Crucifixion was only an incident; and the Incarnation is represented as influencing man by a transfusion of the Divine essence into its nature. The first is the rationalisation attempted by modern philosophy, the second that of the school-men of the Middle Ages. Both are shifts to remove the stumbling-block of the cross, and to cook a sop for the self-sufficiency of human intelligence. "The natural man receiveth not the things of the Spirit of God, for they are foolishness unto him; neither can he know them, because they are spiritually discerned." There may be things in the Bible that are of local and temporary application; but if there is one idea that stands forth from Old and New Testament alike as the central fact of all religion, it is the Propitiatory Sacrifice. Amongst the fundamental principles of revelation we cannot pick and choose. If, after the direct warnings of St. Paul, we try to explain away the Atonement, there is nothing left that will not admit of the same treatment; and the great simple Divine teaching of the cross becomes nothing but a series of imaginative mistakes.

An Eternal Atonement.—What was the new song sung by the four and twenty elders in the culminating vision of St. John, as they fell down before the Lamb that had been slain? "Thou wast slain, and hast redeemed us to God by Thy blood." What was the antiphon of the angels round about the throne, as they chanted in their ranks of ten thousand times ten thousand, and thousands of thousands? "Worthy is the Lamb that was slain to receive power and riches and wisdom and strength." What was the summary of the Lord's work and office given by John Baptist, the last and greatest of the prophets, as the Saviour of the world came forth from private life and entered on His divine ministry? "Behold the Lamb of God, that taketh away the sin of the world." How did our Lord Himself describe that mission? "The Son of Man came to give His life a ransom for many." It was the recognition of Himself as the true Paschal Lamb, for whom every figure and type in the impressive and significant religious system of the Old Testament had been a preparation that made our Lord say, in His allegorical discourse on the Bread of Life, "The bread which I will give is My flesh, which I will give for the life of the world." The same mastering thought was present in His mind in the corresponding discourse on the Good Shepherd, which He twice repeated with emphasis: "The Good Shepherd giveth His life for the sheep." "I lay down My life for the sheep." In His farewell conversation in the upper chamber there was the

same great teaching: "Greater love hath no man than this, that a man lay down his life for his friends." This was the meaning of the Last Supper; as the faithful Hebrew partook of the Paschal Lamb to show his belief in that ordained sacrifice for sin, so the faithful Christian would partake of the one great final sacrifice of Christ by the emblems of bread and wine: "This is My blood of the New Testament, which is shed for many for the remission of sins." This was the meaning of the agony in the garden when He prayed three times, that if it were possible the cup might pass from Him. This was the significance of that most pathetic cry on the cross, "My God, My God, why hast Thou forsaken Me?" This was the immortal lesson of that other cry of satisfaction, "It is finished." This was the wonderful and priceless account that, after His resurrection, He gave of His own human life: "Thus it is written, and thus it behoved Christ to suffer, and to rise from the dead the third day; and that repentance and remission of sins should be preached in His Name among all nations." His life was no mere fortunate and fortuitous concourse of circumstances by which, through a series of necessary antagonisms between light and darkness, the Jews at length put Him to death, which He met with exemplary and divine heroism. It was infinitely more than that. His death was an epoch in the history of the heavens and the earth. "He was wounded for our transgressions, He was bruised for our iniquities; the chastisement of our peace was upon Him, and with His stripes we are healed. All we like sheep have gone astray; we have turned every one to his own way; and the Lord hath laid on Him the iniquity of us all." The Atonement was foreseen in the eternal providence of God; He was "the Lamb slain," not merely because of the spite and hatred of the Jews, "but from the foundation of the world."

The Apostles' Testimony.—My brothers, it is important that we should remind ourselves how this was the burden of the teaching of the Apostles throughout the whole New Testament. Listen to St. Peter on the Day of Pentecost: "Him, being delivered by the determinate counsel and foreknowledge of God, have ye taken, and by wicked hands have crucified and slain." It was by appeal to the power of the Atonement that the Apostles worked their deeds of wonder: "Be it known unto you all, and to all the people of Israel, that by the name of Jesus Christ of Nazareth, whom ye crucified, whom God raised from the dead, even by Him doth this man stand before you whole." This was the doctrine which Philip explained to the eunuch out of the 53rd chapter of Isaiah: 'Philip opened his mouth, and began at the same Scripture, and preached unto him Jesus." What was the main point of St. Paul's great typical sermon at Antioch? "Be it known unto you, men and brethren, that through this Man is preached unto you the forgiveness of sins; and by Him all that believe are justified from all things." What was his solemn parting charge to the elders of Ephesus? "Take heed to feed the Church of God, which He hath purchased with His own blood." What was the upshot of his immortal Epistle to the Romans, the most characteristic, careful, and systematic of all his writings? "The righteousness of God which is by faith of Jesus Christ unto all and upon all them that believe; for there is no difference; for all have sinned and come short of the glory of God; being justified freely by His grace, through the redemption that is in Christ Jesus; whom God hath set forth to be a propitiation through faith in His blood, to declare His righteousness for the remission of sins that are past." And, again: "When we were yet without strength, in due time Christ died for the ungodly. . . . God commended His love toward us, in that, while we were yet sinners, Christ died for us. Much more, then, being now justified by His blood, shall we be saved from wrath through Him." What was the first article of the creed which he gave to the Corinthians? "I delivered unto you, first of all, that which I also received, how that Christ died for our sins, according to the Scriptures." That was his Gospel to the Galatians: "Grace to you from our Lord Jesus Christ, who gave Himself for our sins, that He might deliver us from this present evil world, according to the will of God and our Father"; "Christ hath redeemed us from the curse of the law, being made a curse for us"; "God forbid that I should glory, save in the cross of our Lord Jesus Christ, by whom the world is crucified unto me, and I unto the world." That was the message which converted the Ephesians: "In whom we have redemption through His blood, the forgiveness of sins, according to the riches of His grace"; "Now in Christ Jesus, ye who sometimes were far off are made nigh by the blood of Christ, for He is our peace"; "Christ also hath loved us, and given Himself for us an offering and a sacrifice to God for a sweet-smelling savour." What was the characteristic fact of our Lord's life which he pressed with all his eloquence on the attention of the Philippians? "He humbled Himself, and became obedient unto death, even the death of the cross." It was the same glad tidings that he preached to the Colossians: "In Him we have redemption through His blood, even the forgiveness of our sins." . . . "Having made peace through the blood of His cross, it pleased the Father by Him to reconcile all things unto Himself, whether they be things in earth or things in heaven; and you, that were sometimes alienated, and enemies in your mind by wicked works, yet now hath He reconciled in the body of His flesh through death." Everywhere it is the same—to the Thessalonians: "God hath not appointed us to wrath, but to obtain salvation through our Lord

Jesus Christ, who died for us"; to Timothy: "This is a faithful saying, and worthy of all acceptation, that Christ Jesus came into the world to save sinners"; and to Titus: "He gave Himself for us, that He might redeem us from all iniquity." Possibly in the Epistle to the Hebrews we have the writings of the same St. Paul, possibly one that is independent; but the evidence is identical. The argument of the whole Epistle is founded on the fulfilment of the ancient sacrifices and types by the propitiation of Christ. Unless that argument represents a solid and permanent truth it is a mere rhetorical exercise. "We see Jesus, Who was made a little while lower than the angels for the suffering of death, crowned with glory and honour, that He, by the grace of God, should taste death for every man." "He needeth not daily, as those high priests, to offer up sacrifice first for His own sins and then for the people's; for this He did once, when He offered up Himself." "Christ being come an High Priest of good things to come, by a greater and more perfect tabernacle, not made with hands, that is to say, not of this building; neither by the blood of goats and of calves, but by His own blood, He entered in once into the Holy Place, having obtained eternal redemption for us." . . . "Once, in the end of the world, hath He appeared, to put away sin by the sacrifice of Himself." . . . "Christ was once offered to bear the sins of many." . . . "We are sanctified by the offering of the body of Jesus Christ once for all. And every priest standeth daily ministering, and offering oftentimes the same sacrifices, which can never take away sins; but this Man, after He had offered one sacrifice for sins for ever, sat down on the right hand of God.' St. Peter brims with the same supreme significance of all Christianity: the title of his hearers to be Christians is that they are sprinkled with the blood of Jesus; they were redeemed with the precious blood of Christ as of a lamb without blemish and without spot, Who verily was fore-ordained before the foundation of the world. "Who His own self," he exclaims, "bare our sins in His own body on the tree, that we being dead to sins should live unto righteousness; by Whose stripes ye were healed." These views of our Lord, and the Evangelists, and St. Paul and St. Peter, were not merely accidental expressions of Jewish conservative fervour; years afterwards they were as clear, as strong, as definite, as predominant, in St. John: "The blood of Jesus Christ His Son cleanseth us from all sin." . . . "He is the propitiation for our sins." . . . "Hereby perceive we the love of God, because He laid down His life for us." . . . "Herein is love, not that we loved God, but that He loved us, and sent His Son to be the propitiation for our sins."

Old Testament Prescience.—My brothers, it is impossible that all these inspired writers should have been under a hallucination, and should have been intended to convey, under obsolete Jewish metaphors, some subtle philosophical doctrine which would be left for the school-men or for the nineteenth century to discover. And we must not forget the Old Testament. The New Testament is founded most largely, emphatically, and entirely on the Old. To our Lord Himself the Old Testament was definitely prophetic of the New. To us, if we wish to be of the same mind as our Lord, it cannot be otherwise. In the Old Testament His sacrifice for sin is foreshadowed in a degree, and with a preponderating definiteness, as to which no other aspect of His life, not even His Incarnation, can be compared. Think of the whole ritual of the Levitical code; think of the Day of Atonement; think of the Paschal Lamb; think of the whole system as interpreted by the Epistle to the Hebrews; think of the 53rd chapter of Isaiah, nearly every verse of which is quoted in the New Testament; think of the Last Supper; think of the comment of the risen Lord Himself that the main burthen of prophecy was that the Messiah should suffer! Oh! choose any other religion you like, construct a new religion if you please out of Christianity; but if you accept Christianity itself, acknowledge it with humility and gratitude, simply and conscientiously as God Himself revealed His purpose to mankind.

The Teaching of the Fathers.—It was in this sense that the doctrine of salvation through Christ was understood by the greatest of the Fathers. Ask Clement of Rome, who is mentioned in St. Paul's Epistles. "Let us fix our eyes," he says, "on the blood of Christ, and see how precious it is to His God and Father, because being shed for our salvation, it was for the whole world the grace of repentance." And again: "Our Lord Jesus Christ gave His blood for us in the will of God, and His flesh for our flesh, and His life for our lives." Ask the author of the Epistle to Diognetus, which belongs to the early part of the second century: "When our unrighteousness had reached the full, God Himself gave His Son a ransom on our behalf. . . . the just for the unjust. . . . For what else was able to hide our sins, but His righteousness? Oh, blessed exchange! . . . that so the iniquity of many should be hidden by One Righteous, and the righteousness of One should justify many iniquitous." Ask Irenæus: "The Lord ransomed us by His own blood, and gave His life for our life, and His flesh for our flesh." In the immediate context Irenæus is dwelling on the fact that the Atonement had for a main end the satisfaction of the claims of justice. Ask Justin Martyr: "The Universal Father willed that His own Messiah, on behalf of men of every race, should receive on Him the curses of all, knowing that He would raise Him up after crucifixion and death." Ask the philosophic Origen: "God set Him forth to be a propitiation through faith in His blood—that is, through the sacrifice of His body to make God propitious to men. . . . For God is

just, and the just cannot justify the unjust; therefore He willed the intervention of the Propitiator, that through faith in Him they might be justified who could not be through their own works." Ask Athanasius, the father of thoughtful Catholic belief: "The Son of God came into the world, not to judge the world, but that He might redeem all men, and that the world might be saved through Him. For of old the world as an accused person was judged under the law; but now the Word hath received on Himself the judgment, and suffering in His body on behalf of all men, hath granted salvation unto all." . . . "He offered His sacrifice for all, giving up to death the Temple of His own body in the stead of all, that He might set all free from the guilt of the original transgression." Lastly, ask St. Augustine, the father of modern theology: "The transgressions belong to us; the suffering for us belongs to our Head. But because of His suffering for us, all that belongs to us of transgression is discharged." These are only specimens of a great treasure-house of teaching. All along there appears in the Fathers this supreme sense of the profound propitiatory value in the death of our Lord.

THE CHURCH'S WITNESS.—My brothers, that is emphatically the doctrine of our own branch of the Catholic Church. "Christ truly suffered, was crucified, dead and buried, to reconcile His Father to us, and to be a sacrifice not only for original guilt, but also for all actual sins of men." "We are accounted righteous before God, only for the merit of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ, by faith, and not for our own works or deservings." That is the leading thought of our Communion Service: "The most comfortable Sacrament of the Body and Blood of Christ, to be by us received in remembrance of His meritorious cross and Passion, whereby alone we obtain remission of our sins." "As the Son of God did vouchsafe to yield up His soul by death upon the cross for your salvation; so it is your duty to receive the Communion in remembrance of the sacrifice of His death, as He Himself hath commanded." "Above all things ye must give most humble and hearty thanks to God the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost, for the redemption of the world by the death and passion of our Saviour Christ, both God and man; Who did humble Himself, even to the death upon the cross, for us miserable sinners, who lay in darkness and in the shadow of death; that He might make us the children of God and exalt us to everlasting life. And to the end that we should alway remember the exceeding great love of our Master and only Saviour Jesus Christ, thus dying for us, and the innumerable benefits which, by His precious blood-shedding, He hath obtained to us; He hath instituted and ordained holy mysteries as pledges of His love, and for a continual remembrance of His death, to our great and endless comfort." And in the central portion of that sublime service, the prayer of consecration, we call on "Almighty God, our Heavenly Father, who of His tender mercy did give His only Son Jesus Christ to suffer death upon the cross for our redemption; who made there, by His one oblation of Himself once offered, a full, perfect, and sufficient sacrifice, oblation, and satisfaction for the sins of the whole world; and did institute, and in His Holy Gospel command us to continue, a perpetual memory of that His precious death, until His coming again."

O, my brothers, the sacrificial sufferings of our Lord Jesus Christ are the measure of the eternal difference between right and wrong. You would not be happy even if your own mother could read every thought that had ever passed through your heart. You know that even her great love could not rise superior to all the record of guilt, of hatred, of ugliness, which you find in your conscience. How could you face Him who combines perfect knowledge with perfect holiness? It is impossible. You would be for ever covered with direst shame and confusion. But when the eternal justice of a broken law can be vindicated by the voluntary submission to universal punishment of the Son of God Himself, then we can feel the blessedness of him whose iniquity is pardoned, and whose sin is covered. All that relates to God must be a mystery; but we can see the meaning of the warning given against moral disorder by so tremendous a propitiation. By humble faith we can accept the pardon of our Heavenly Father, who willeth not the death of a sinner. With our beloved teacher St. Paul we can cry out, "O the depth of the riches both of the wisdom and knowledge of God! how unsearchable are His judgments, and His ways past finding out!" And the pride of our intellect being abased, and the wisdom of the world being set aside, it is with the warmest and truest aspirations of our hearts that we respond, when our Lord in His infinite lovingkindness condescends to say to us, "I am the Way."

THE *Cambridge Chronicle* says that the Bishop of Ely has been suffering from an attack of influenza, but adds that his lordship is making good progress towards recovery.

ERRATA.—Last week, on p. 164, the following errors escaped notice:—"in" for "as" in the 17th line of the first column, and "we" for "are" in the 10th and 11th lines of the second column.

THE *Manchester Guardian* says that Canon Cross, vicar of St. Andrew's, Stockport, has intimated that he is about to seek a change, for some five or six months, at Carlsbad, during which absence he has arranged, with the Bishop of Liverpool's permission, for the Rev. John F. Hocter, vicar of Maghull, to take charge of the parish. The Canon further announces that, failing to derive any benefit from this change, he must resign the benefice of St. Andrew's, of which he was appointed first vicar twenty-one years ago.

THE DAWN OF CHRISTIANITY.*

By the Rev. W. C. E. NEWBOLT, Canon of St. Paul's.

Sermon Preached at St. Paul's Cathedral, on Easter Sunday, April 2nd, 1893.

"The Lord is risen indeed, and hath appeared to Simon." —St. Luke xxiv. 34.

AT length, then, the good news has asserted itself. The Lord is risen indeed. The morning, which began in gloom, and in the dread of a cruel insult, brightened into hope. As the day wore on, fitful and fleeting gleams flashed out behind the scudding storm-rack it had lit up into an impression. And now in the evening, as the two return with their own glad experience, it is to find the house, which they left in the gloom of doubt, flooded with the light of certainty. The clouds had rolled away; fear, gloom, suspense, the torture of suppressed hope had melted before the gathering glory. "The Lord is risen indeed"—what a bright welcome back—"and hath appeared to Simon"—to Simon the Rock who could strengthen his brethren, or to Simon whose faith had given way? The same tender, loving Lord. It is impossible to doubt which.

"Christ is risen!" the cry goes up whose echoes float in joyous cadences down the centuries of Christian life. "Christ is risen!" sings religion, overwhelmed with the fulness of her privilege. "Christ is risen!" tosses back morality, in an antiphon of joy, as new virtues elevate the body of our humiliation into the likeness of His glorious Body. "Christ is risen!" sings art, shaking her plumes for a higher flight. "Christ is risen!" answers poetry, alive with a new inspiration. "Christ is risen!" cries the mourner, out of his tears. "Christ is risen!" shouts the penitent out of his captivity. "The world itself keeps Easter Day," as the old carol tells us. There is a spring feeling in the air, a joy thrills through the services, the heart feels lighter after the tension of a great effort:—

Spring-led birds are singing, singing,
For the daybreak in the East;
Silver bells are ringing, ringing,
For the Church's glorious feast.
Christ is risen! Christ is risen!
Sin's long triumph now is o'er.
Christ is risen! Death's dark prison
Now can hold the saints no more.
Christ is risen! risen, brother!
Brother, Christ is risen indeed!

"And hath appeared to Simon." Ah! here we drop into simple, prosaic, yet necessary evidence. The Resurrection may be a beautiful theme, a subject for poetry, an incentive to the imagination. But how do we know it is true? Even a St. Thomas felt this. He was absent from this impressionable band of unquestioning and interested followers on Easter Day, he never gave in until the enthusiasm of the others involved him in the same ecstatic receptivity. An hysterical woman commences it, emotional women carry it on. An apostle, unstrung by an act of palpable cowardice and desertion on his part, imagines. A sympathetic stranger assumes an importance in the eyes of two wayfarers, which they elevate into the supernatural, the one exciting the other; the eleven are in a condition to fancy anything, and believe anything, in their barred and bolted assembly. Is this so? Did the Apostles underrate the importance of evidence, or the character of their witnesses when they made the Resurrection the foundation of their preaching? St. Peter, when speaking at Cæsarea, so far from thinking this to be unimportant, deliberately says that the witnesses were chosen; that our blessed Lord chose to make use of His own intimate friends and followers in publishing this great truth. And St. Paul, in his creed-like enunciation of the facts of the Redemption, in his Epistle to the Corinthians, mentions several groups of appearances of our Lord, after His Resurrection, as the buttress-supports of his great doctrine, "That He rose again the third day according to the Scriptures."

What do we expect? What do we want? What evidence do we think the best? Do we imagine that this is an experience which should have been brought, as it were, before a committee of experts, who could give us a cut-and-dried report of the truth of the Resurrection? Experts! It is exactly to these that our blessed Lord did show Himself after His Resurrection. To men and women whom He had educated to pursue a phenomenon of the spiritual world in its spiritual bearings, men and women to whom the Resurrection would appear not as an isolated phenomenon, divorced from all similar causes, belonging to no series, reduceable to no scheme, but rather as the working out of causes which had been pointed out to them, of a scheme whose foundation they had seen solidly laid; the filling up of a void in a system which needed the Resurrection, an answer to a hopeless puzzle, inextricable without it. Religion as well as science has its experts, men whom God gradually leads on by experience and comparison to understand the real meaning of spiritual phenomena. And in this connection it is not a little significant to notice that the Apostles who had missed the preparation of Good Friday, were least prepared to welcome the mystery of Easter, whereas in the Magdalene and St. Peter, both of whom had undergone a special experience, there was a preparedness to receive the earliest manifestation of the risen Lord.

If we, too, would be witnesses of the Resurrection, we must be of the number of those who day by day are adding to the stock of religious phenomena studied in the dark night of sorrow, separated

* This sermon has appeared in *The Guardian*.

from the brilliant rays of joy, learned on the mountain-top, verified on the lake, confirmed on Calvary, patiently waited for in the closed tomb. If our great naturalist could take twenty-nine years to verify an experiment, a witness of the Resurrection is not to be looked for in the compass of a magazine article, or in the mere sifting of Scripture evidences.

Of the witnesses of the Resurrection, St. Paul, in the passage already alluded to, enumerates four groups, the first of which is St. Peter and the Twelve (the word twelve being used in its popular significance, although the number was not then full), and I would venture to protest at the outset against any attempt to fill up what Holy Scripture has left blank, or to invent imaginary conversations between our blessed Lord and St. Peter, when we are simply told in two places that a manifestation was vouchsafed to St. Peter (as we infer) on Easter Day, first by himself, and then with the other apostles in the Upper Room.

But having said this, we cannot forget who St. Peter was, and the wonderful significance of this meeting. If we were to suppose that not one word passed between them, we cannot forget the time when they last met, when that sacred face was buffeted and covered with insult, when friends had forsaken, and foes were triumphing, and then he, St. Peter, the Rock, against warning, in the teeth of his own protestations, had said, not once nor twice, that he did not know Him. When last they had met, one glance had been enough to drive him out into the night and weep away his cowardly treachery in an agony of repentance; and now to meet Him, face to face, alone !

> There is a pleading in His pensive eyes
> Will pierce thee to the quick and trouble thee ;
> And thou wilt hate and loathe thyself ; for, though
> Now sinless, thou wilt feel that thou hast sinned
> As never thou didst feel ; and wilt desire
> To slink away, and hide thee from His sight ;
> And yet wilt have a longing aye to dwell
> Within the beauty of His countenance.

Yes, St. Peter has a history; he is moving in the shadow of a great sorrow, which hides him from the sun on this Easter morning. But Christ had already gone to comfort sorrow, and now He comes to reassure penitence. Surely the Easter sun shines down on no heart more full of joy than his who has tasted the bitterness and the joy of penitence. "They that sow in tears shall reap in joy."

Easter Day is the help and the stay of the penitent. There are hundreds and hundreds of people to whom sin has come as a dread, unwelcome visitor, which they have felt powerless to resist. Religion is so unpopular, chief priests and leaders of opinion are against us, disgrace seems imminent, and all the misery of a false and unpopular move. It was so easy to deny, so hard to be brave, but harder still to rise, harder still to dream of forgiveness, and of restoration, of pardon and peace.

Have you ever thought, my brethren, what it must have been in the old world when a man really wished to lead a new and a better life? To whom could he turn? To the gods? They were on a lower level of morality than himself; drunkenness was deified, lust crowned, cunning in Heaven. To religious ceremonies? The path of their progress was strewn with incentives to sin. To his own strength of will? to his sense of propriety? to the guidance of his moral sense? to self-discipline and the love of virtue? One by one they snap before the force of passion, and the fierce sea of temptation comes leaping in upon them, tossing resolution to the wind, and scattering them away like straws before the blast. Who could help; who could lift up? "Now is Christ risen from the dead." Human nature is linked with the Divine, and has passed through death, and a Man who is God, and a God who is Man can help the sons of men, tortured by sins, fettered in their passions, agonised in their sorrows. A life of perfect holiness is mirrored before us, a storehouse of grace is opened to us. There is the great and abiding strength of the Sacrament, the cheering guidance of the Blessed Word, the spiritual hospice of the Church, with its ministry of succour, ever at hand to help wandering sinners. Sin, before Christ came, was a pathless waste, in which many a soul lost its way without hope of recovery. But since He lived and died and rose again, the penitent feels that a higher and better life is open to him. A strong hand is held out to penitents, and St. Peter, who denied treacherously, lovingly forgiven, is being prepared to receive his three-fold charge, and to protest, out of a broken heart, "Lord, Thou knowest all things; Thou knowest that I love Thee."

But if St. Peter had a past our blessed Lord appears to him as one who has a great future before him in the Church. Eventful years had passed since Christ, looking on that impulsive, mercurial temperament in the fisherman, had said: "Thou art Cephas, which is by interpretation a stone. I say unto thee, that thou art Peter, and on this rock I will build My Church." Surface after surface had flaked away—a character which could not bear the weight of a servant's ridicule—how could it bear the weight of the growing Church? Impulse, presumption, readiness, zeal had all fallen away, crushed and pulverised, and now on that bare heart, before self had time to form any fresh layer, was to be laid deep that foundation of personal experience, which nothing hereafter could weaken. "I have seen the Lord"—Oh, impression never to be effaced! Oh, memory never to be obliterated in the darkest hour ; a presence of resurrection beauty, and glory, driving away the storm-cloud of remorse, and drying up the tears of penitence. Impulse is steadied into strength; presumption into humble

undertaking of great things; hastiness into waiting for the Lord; shrinking into steadfastness. The Apostle is being formed whose sermon shall spread the power of Pentecost, whose work shall extend the Church, who in prison and in martyrdom shall learn patiently to wait for Christ. Here was a memory for dark hours—that brilliant Easter morning. Here was a memory when the feelings were tempted to betray reason—that startling meeting with the unchanging Friend. Here was a memory when death was approaching — there behind the veil was that same Form waiting and watching, which had the freedom of the tomb, and the key of death.

It is a memory, a tradition like this that we all need, dear brethren, in a dark hour. Is there any so unhappy as to have no memory of a "day of the Son of Man," some memory of a first communion, when Christ Jesus seemed to meet him with the tenderness of affection and the strength of a great support — some memory of forgiven sin, when Christ seemed to drive back the menacing crowd waiting to condemn, and say, "Neither do I condemn thee; go and sin no more"—some memory of Easter, when the triumph of the Lord seemed bound up with our happiness, and "the joy of the Lord was our strength." It is this personal conviction, this personal experience, which we all need for the work and the failures of life, for its times of tribulation as well as its times of wealth. How much there is which needs sanctifying in our worldly, our natural endowments. How much good work is spoiled by pride, or maimed by temper, or frustrated by selfishness. To have seen the Lord is the consecration of power. It is to turn natural endowments into sanctified gifts. To have seen the Lord is to have within us something of that enthusiasm, that "God within," which we sorely need for the difficulties of life. It is the fashion now to appear to care intensely for nothing, to take religion calmly and easily, to look upon it almost as a sign of bad breeding to be intensely concerned in the questions of the soul, and to interfere with a man's religious beliefs as delicately as you would with the question of his income. The fetish of undenominationalism has its votaries in the religious world, where to be indefinite is to be moderate, to be moderate is to be safe, to be safe is to be committed to nothing, but to be "an honorary member of all forms of religion." "To have seen the Lord," to have felt the enthusiasm of Easter, is once for all to disperse this numbing paralysis—to have the abiding Presence of a sacred memory, which eclipses by its splendour all lower and lesser religious aims. It is this which drives the Aposties back, in spite of blows and threats, with an obstinate persistence—"We cannot but speak the things which we have seen and heard."

Ah! my brethren, in view of the dark clouds which will come driving ever across the Easter sun —when the flowers which deck our altars are also brought to deck the tombs of those whom we have loved and lost—when we know the time is not far distant when around us, too, the mists of death will be stealing—ah! we know, in view of these dark mysteries, the strength of a personal conviction, the memory of a meeting with Jesus Christ, Who is "the Resurrection and the Life"—surely on this Easter Day we shall look out for Him along those roads where He so often came to meet us—of prayer, of meditation, of Sacraments. We shall look out for Him in the quiet walk, we shall look out for Him as we lay the flowers on the grave, we shall expect the thin air to part, where the gusts of melody, and the fragrance of prayer, and the brilliance of worship fill the temple with glory.

To have seen the Lord. It was the seal of forgiveness; but it was also the planting of a conviction.

And St. Peter has passed on into the assembly; he has found the other Apostles; he has told them the secret; and on the first Sunday of the Christian era there is gathered together the nucleus of the future Church, and to them Jesus Christ appears for the fifth time on this Easter Day.

Many things are being started into life to-day—the Sunday instead of the Sabbath. And now the inauguration of that life of power and grace, which has made the Church a blessing to the world. There they are met together in fear and dread—huddled together for fear of the Jews—perhaps to talk over the perplexities of the day; to weigh well the rumours which had reached them. St Mark tells us they were sitting at meat, when, as if in fulfilment of His own promise, "Where two or three are gathered together in My name, there am I in the midst of them." their simple meeting together has become an assembly of the Church—a foreshadowing of the Christian assembly which ever afterwards should meet especially on this day Christ's risen Self is there to consecrate with His blessing and His presence the assembling together of the faithful through the Sundays of yet unawakened Christendom, and the burden of Christ's message to them is peace and power—not to look into the deeper mysteries of the moment or to study those words of which we clergy have each of us felt the power at the most solemn moments of our lives. This is the impression, this is the prevailing result of that solemn meeting in the assembly of the great Easter—peace and power.

And where the Church has been true to herself these have ever been the prevailing characteristics of her life. Pass through the length and breadth of the land, and look at the parish churches in towns and villages, standing where for centuries they have been the quiet witness for God, where generations have come and gone, and the history of the land has written its record on their walls—still they stand, an influence of peace, a sacrament of power.

Look at the great cathedrals. Who can tell how

much good they did, even in the darkest times of neglect and gloom, by the quiet witness of their grand structures, or even by the refining influences of the musical service which they imperfectly kept up? Who can measure now the influence on the nation of being publicly and solemnly allied with a definite profession of belief in what is called an Established Church? But if we think of the individual Christian, we shall see this even clearer. Christ's presence in His Church is to Him a presence of peace and power. Sometimes we can see remaining in old churches a ring on the door, which local tradition calls the sanctuary-ring, pointing back, if the tradition be true, to the old days of sanctuary, when the pursued might escape to the church, in days of rude law and imperfect security, and there be safe from his enemies. We know, at all events, what it is to be able to escape to the Church from the pursuit of an overwhelming temptation and the talons of a menacing case. Short of this, every day we live we have to thank God for the help and blessing of His presence in His Church. Those whose life has been moulded by the Church's services know what a help it has been to them. There flows on the great round of fast and festival. It rejoices when they rejoice, it weeps when they weep. The streams of life flow into it and flow out of it; still it goes on. Now, it is the seven Bishops, imprisoned for conscience' sake, who are cheered on the day of their discharge by the account of the deliverance of St. Peter from prison, which was being read as a lesson for the day in a church into which they turned. Last year, when the nation mourned for the young Prince, the newspapers were startled by what they called "the painful appropriateness" of the Sunday services. It is always so; the service of the Church, when it is allowed to flow into our life, never grows wearisome, never seems out of touch with our joys or sorrows. Here we learn as nowhere else the deep truths of our religion, as they are brought out one by one before us in the Christian year, with the prelude of prayer, the setting of praise, the comment of Holy Scripture. Here Christ Himself seems to meet us and say "Peace!" Here Christ seems to meet us and give us power, as of old He stood in the midst of His disciples on the first Easter day, and said, "Peace be unto you:" and breathing on them, said, "Receive ye the Holy Ghost," turning their meeting of fear and suspense into a foretaste of the blessing which His Presence would be to His Church, of the peace which would envelop their lives. So that even when they meet again eight days hence, there is no more mention of closed doors or fear of the Jews; the peace of God is the garrison which keeps their heart and mind, through Christ Jesus.

"Christ is risen!" Peak after peak has flashed the glorious new—the Magdalene, St. Peter, the Women, the two friends, the Apostles—and still the message speeds on. There are depths of sin and degradation here in London waiting for its cheering beams. There are penitent hearts waiting for its comfort—Africa, India, China, Japan; the vast regions of heathendom still wait to hear the glorious Easter news. It is for us to kindle the beacon of holiness, so that others may see our good works, and glorify our Father which is in heaven.

"Christ is risen!" This is the song which binds earth and heaven in one on Easter Day. With this we part with our loved ones; with this they answer us from the other land. With this we lay us down to rest; the echo of this we listen for from beyond the grave. There is, it is said, a beautiful custom in certain parts of Sicily, when the fishermen are going out on some expedition into the deep sea, their wives and children accompany them to the shore, and as they embark they raise their voices together in a hymn of praise to God; and as they put out to sea those in the boat answer those on the shore in an antiphon of devotion, verse by verse, until their voices die away in the distance, and the yearning sea carries them out of sight and hearing. So we to-day stand on the shore of eternity, and as soul after soul puts forth into the deep and passes from our sight, we raise a song of confidence, "Christ is risen." And the answer comes back from the bosom of that boundless ocean—

> "Christ is risen, risen brother,
> Brother, Christ is risen indeed."

THE Bishop of Hull has received the Volunteer Officers' Decoration for twenty years' service as chaplain in the Volunteer forces.

THE difficulties with regard to the Bishop of Wakefield's new house are now happily at an end, the corporation having withdrawn their requirements as to the alterations. The Bishop is now in occupation of the house, and his address is permanently "Bishopgarth, Wakefield."

THE Ecclesiastical Commissioners have notified the following grants to benefices in the Northern Province:—£550 towards defraying the cost of a parsonage for the rectory of St. Clement's, Lower Broughton, Manchester; £700 towards the endowment of the perpetual curacy of All Saints', North Moor, Oldham; £500 towards defraying the cost of a parsonage for the vicarage of St. Paul's, Scouthead, Lees, near Oldham; £700 in augmentation of the perpetual curacy of St. Wenefrede's, Bickley, near Malpas; £200 in augmentation of the vicarage of St. Luke's, Church Hulme, or Holmes Chapel, Crewe; £300 in augmentation of the vicarage of High Worsall-with-Low Worsall, near Yarm, Yorkshire; £300 in augmentation of the vicarage of St. John Evangelist's, Langcliffe, near Settle, Yorkshire; £225 towards defraying the cost of improving the parsonage of St. Augustine's, Seissett, near Huddersfield; £300 towards the endowment of the vicarage of Christ Church, Stannington, near Sheffield; £600 towards the endowment of the new vicarage of St. Paul's, Westleigh, Leigh, Lancashire; and £500 in augmentation of the vicarage of Widrington, near Acklington, Northumberland.

NOTICES.

All communications respecting the Literary portion of the paper should be addressed to the Editor.

Business communications of every kind should be addressed to Mr. S. GIBBON, at the CHURCH OF ENGLAND PULPIT Office, 160, Fleet Street, London, E.C., to whom cheques and Post-office orders for subscriptions (in advance), three months, 2s., six months, 3s. 6d., twelve months, 6s. 6d., are to be made payable.

The Cases for binding Vol. XXXIV. are now ready.

FOR HEALTH AND IMMORTALITY.

The Ecclesiastical Review.

SATURDAY, APRIL 15, 1893.

THE PUBLIC-HOUSE PLUNDER BILL.

IT is amusing to read Saturday's *Daily News* on the Trafalgar-square demonstration against the Local Veto Bill. The Gladstonian organ tries harder than ever to blow hot and cold with the same mouth. Remembering too well all that it has said in support of "the Square" as the oracle (so to speak) of the British workman, it cannot begin by throwing it over. So it expresses sorrowful surprise at that good man's obtusity in not perceiving that the Bill is only one for promoting conferences between the rich man and the poor man after all. It just allows the two classes to meet and talk over matters. What could be better for the poor man than this opportunity of letting his voice be heard? So far the plaint of the *Daily News*. Then its tone changes. Nearer contemplation of the disagreeable fact that there will be a demonstration, and that the wrong utterance will come through the oracle, vexes it beyond patience, and, *mirabile dictu*, it launches forth into a scornful protest against these sham demonstrations. O times, O manners! after all the chosen prophet of Gladstonism falls to cursing, quite like a common person, when he is rubbed the wrong way.

Still, in his denunciations, the scribe of the *Daily News* is careful of one point. He says no word in favour of this miserable Bill. In fact he whittles it down to a mere palaver between rich and poor, which need not result in the extinction of a solitary beer-house. And this is the epitaph (virtually) of one of the boasted Government measures for the regeneration of society. With a view to this Local Veto Bill the Gladstonians and the temperance advocates combined to destroy Mr. Goschen's Bill three years ago, a Bill which, if made law, would confessedly have suppressed a number of the superfluous public-houses, the existence of which we all deplore. That Bill was deliberately destroyed, in spite of the advantages it offered, because it was not a measure of confiscation. The Gladstonians brought in a measure of confiscation, pure and simple, as soon as the pulse of the country was felt, they were a little delicate on the confiscation point. Now they have even dropped the intention of reducing the drink traffic, and the most the official organ of the Gladstonians can do for it is to plead in its favour as a means of inviting conference. As to the members of the party they have all but given up the Bill.

And this is the outcome of Gladstonian temperance legislation! The party stands convicted of having deliberately frustrated the attempt of Lord Salisbury's Government to deal with the drink evil, with the pledge that they would go more to the root of the matter themselves. They have kept their promise by making a sham attempt at passing an impossible measure, which will speedily be consigned to oblivion. Meantime the drink evil goes on, and it may be years before an opportunity occurs of dealing with it as it might have been dealt with three years ago. It is a melancholy prospect for those who put morality before party. This drink curse is a running sore in our nation, and the wound is kept open and the patient suffers more and more while the physicians disagree, or rather because one physician insists on hindering the other. We may well ask how long the people of this country will tolerate such a state of things.

HOIST WITH HIS OWN PETARD.

MR. C. H. WILSON, shipowner of Hull and Gladsonian M.P., is now a sadder and, let us hope, a wiser man. At least he has been conscientious. Carried away by protestations which he did not understand to be merely politic expressions kept for platform use, be endeavoured to practise the principles which all Gladstonian orators profess. To "trust the people" was not, in his mind, a purely pious, and unintelligible, aspiration; he meant what he said. Accordingly he departed from the Shipping Federation, he was at pains to introduce and develop in Hull trades-unionism, he was cordial to the labour leaders, and generous to the men. In fact Mr. Wilson has given a full and fair trial to those theories which politicians, who have no hing to do with business, profess to contain the regeneration of our industrial system.

What has been the result? Mr. Wilson has been mobbed on his own quay and has had to seek the protection of the police. With the assistance of that very Shipping Federation, the dust of which

he once shook from his feet, he is fighting a strike aimed at ruining him and his business, and at Hull now rages a labour war which threatens to involve many of the ports of the kingdom. We cannot believe it will continue. Little as we respect the integrity and intelligence of most of the "labour leaders," it hardly seems possible that they are blind to the consequences of such an *exposé* of their methods and pretensions. A compromise will probably be arrived at, and that speedily. But the lesson, we trust, will not be lost. Constant dropping will wear away a rock, and constant and noisy reiteration has led many people to think that the labour agitator has some right on his side. Well, here is the answer to that. Mr. Wilson was such a person. He has done his very best to meet the agitators on their own ground and on their own terms. And he has been made the victim of such injustice, extortion and persecution, that he has been obliged to recant and give battle to his former allies. It is an instructive though a painful lesson. Is it too much to hope that this strike at Hull will open a way of escape at last out of the ruin which has long been impending over our industries?

Reviews and Notices.

"THE EXPOSITORY TIMES" April, 1893. Edinburgh: T. and T. Clark.

IN the "Notes on Recent Exposition," the account of a book called "The Ideal in Judaism" is very interesting. Modern Judaism must be put to great straits, between the Christian creed on the one side and the so-called higher criticism on the other. But it will have a third enemy—to wit, the sense of the ridiculous if it follows the author of this book and makes God, duty, separation and *abstinence from ham* its ideal.

Dr. Cameron, of Aberdeen, takes Joshua xxii. as a fair test for examining the value of Professor Driver's theories. And we should very much like to see an answer — not a cloud of rhetoric or some vague generalities, but an answer thereto by Canon Driver or one of his followers.

Mr Horton's "Revelation and the Bible" is somewhat searchingly reviewed, and, we should say, his position—that Christ does not depend on the New Testament writings, but the New Testament writings depend on Him—shown to be one of those half truths which may become the source of very dangerous errors

Professor Blackie has a very good paper on the "Sequence of the Christian Virtues" (2 Peter i. 5-7); and there is much besides well worth notice in the number.

"THE EXPOSITOR." April, 1893. London: Hodder and Stoughton.

DR DAVIDSON'S paper on the "Earlier Ideas of Isaiah" is very interesting; the force of the vision in the Temple (Is. vi.) is well brought out.

Mr. Cross examines the well-known variations of words in our Lord's appeal to St. Peter, recorded in St. John xxi. 15-17. We will quote his conclusion verbatim: "One cannot help thinking that the minute study of the text of the New Testament in modern times, while it has undoubtedly done much to elucidate the full meaning of the sacred record, has sometimes carried scholars too far in refinement of interpretation. They attribute to the New Testament writers an accuracy of language which the English translators certainly did not aim at. Is there any reason for so doing?" Substituting for "language" translation, we should then agree with Mr. Cross. It should always be remembered that no one of the Evangelists, except occasionally St. Mark, ever gives us Christ's very words, but what he considered to be the Greek equivalent of them. We should doubt if the subtleties of the Greek always existed in the Aramaic, or if the Evangelists were always more careful to reproduce them, when possible, in the Greek than our translators.

In the paper on "Divorce and Childhood," Mr. Darlow asks, Dare we reverently recognise in His peculiar tenderness for children some pathetic trace of the hunger of a childless heart? Not in the present day, we reply, when there is already far too much tendency towards gush and sentimentalism in religion, otherwise the paper is very good, and brings out the two incidents—the question about divorce and the receiving the children—very forcibly.

"THE THINKER." March and April, 1893. London: James Nisbet and Co.

THIS magazine is decidedly coming more and more to the front. Though evangelical in thought—and so much the better—it is wholly different in tone from the mere "No Popery" evangelicalism of past years.

Amongst many good papers we would commend Mr. Crawford's on the "Strength and Weakness of Evangelicalism" in the March number, and Dr. Marshall Lang's on the "Church and the Labour Problem" in the April number.

CORRESPONDENCE.

To the Editor of the CHURCH OF ENGLAND PULPIT AND ECCLESIASTICAL REVIEW.

FALSE DOCTRINE, HERESY, AND SCHISM.

SIR,—I hope you will allow just a line to say how pleased I am with the scriptural and theological definition of the above subject by your able correspondent Rev W. T. Hobson. For my part I do not see how it can be treated otherwise. and also regarding the Calvinistic interpretation of which certainly no other explanation could be possibly given in contradistinction to the views advanced by your original correspondent Mr. Murphy.

THOMAS HEATH.

Plymouth.

SIR,—The Rev. Mr. Hobson, in this day's PULPIT, says it sounds like a contradiction in terms to say that a man may hold heretical doctrine without being himself a heretic.

St. John says, "If we say that we have no sin, we

deceive ourselves" (1st Epistle i. 8); and in the same Epistle, "Whosoever abideth in (Christ) sinneth not" (iii. 5). No one is free from sin, but he that abideth in Christ abideth not in sin. In the same way, no one, probably, holds all religious truth aright, but those who believe in God through Christ with unfeigned faith out of a pure heart are not heretics.

JOSEPH JOHN MURPHY.

Belfast, April 8th, 1893.

PRAYER BOOK CHAUNTS.

SIR,—I have a common Prayer Book of the early years of this century, with paraphrases of Psalms and chaunts at end. One of the chaunts paraphrased is the *Te Deum laudamus*, and it is the best rendering after the Brady and Tate manner of any that I have seen anywhere. There are, however, three verses left out, "Make them" to "Govern them." Can anyone inform me where an unbroken copy of this paraphrase is to be found?

B.

THE Bishop of Ely has fixed June 27th, 28th, for the next meeting of the Diocesan Conference, in the south transept of the cathedral, of clergy and laity of the diocese.

MR. HENRY OUGH, of the firm of Henry Ough and Son, architects, of St. Paul's-Churchyard, has been appointed one of the diocesan surveyors of St. Albans diocese under the Ecclesiastical Dilapidations Act, 1871.

IN response to the Bishop of Ripon's appeal, Canon Stratten has signified his intention of contributing £100 a year for three years to the Ripon Poor Clergy Fund. Mr. Walter Morrison, of Malham Tarn, has sent £100, and Mr. William Lupton has promised £10 a year.

THE vicar of Thornton, near Fleetwood (the Rev. Thomas Meadows) has informed his parishioners that during the last six years he has collected £1,000 for the endowment of the living, which sum will be quadrupled by the Ecclesiastical Commissioners and the Governors of Queen Anne's Bounty.

ON Sunday last the Rev. James Bradshaw, one of the oldest clergymen in the diocese of Lichfield, completed his fiftieth year in holy orders, the whole of the time having been spent in the archdeaconry of Stafford. Mr. Bradshaw graduated at Cambridge (Catharine Hall) in 1843, and was ordained the same year, his first curacy being at Darlaston Parish Church.

THE advance portion of an expedition left London on the 4th inst. for Mozambique, where it is proposed to form an English settlement. It is intended to colonise nearly 300 square miles of territory between the rivers Zambesi and Sabi, acquired by the Premier Concessions of Mozambique Company, and confirmed by the Anglo-Portuguese Convention of 1891. Captain L. F. Spring is the chief of the expedition.

THE *Pall Mall Gazette* affirms that "the Bishop of Oxford has declined to institute the Rev. J. B. Higham, curate of East Claydon, Buckinghamshire, to the vicarage of Steeple Claydon, on the nomination of Sir Harry Verney, on the ground, it is understood, of some doctrinal views. Mr. Higham has just preached his farewell sermon at East Claydon, in the presence of Sir Harry Verney and an immense congregation, but made no allusion to the matter."

THE *Yorkshire Post* says that a singular circumstance has occurred in connection with the appointment of the Rev. Dr. Cox, of Barton-le-Street, to the vicarage of St. Margaret, Anfield, in succession to the Bishop-designate of Norwich. It was naturally supposed that Mr. Gladstane had nominated him; but it now appears that the patron had done so in ignorance that the Crown appoints for this turn. "Efforts are being made on Dr. Cox's behalf with the Premier to have the appointment confirmed."

THE Rochester Diocesan Conference is fixed for Thursday and Friday, June 8th and 9th, at Rochester. Notices of motion are to be sent to Canon Grant, Aylesford, by May 1st. The *Rochester Diocesan Chronicle* states that an offer has been made—not by Cook and Sons—to personally conduct the members of the Conference round the cathedral, indicating its beauties and its needs. We hope it may be found possible to accept it; it would do much to interest the Conference, and indirectly the diocese, in the work of restoration which is going on.

SUGGESTIVE HINTS FOR TEACHERS AND WORKERS, No. 4.—The Afflictions of Job. Read Job ii. 1-10.—We find Job sorely tried by Satan. It was a time in the history of the great saint that would be put to the severest test. Notice all went sadly against Job, but after all his faithfulness to God he was not forsaken. The very extremest ordeals were imposed to test him and this Satan. Job's wife and friends must have noticed in a very remarkable manner, nevertheless his confidence in God was not shaken. Satan has tried others. Yes, even our blessed Lord and Saviour was sorely tempted by the Evil one. But he was overcame by Him who came to destroy the works of Satan and vanquish his power. What encouragement it is for us that He thus was tempted and tried like we, and how we may have faith and strength given us that we may overcome the manifold temptations of the world, the flesh, and the devil. Job, like others, was led by experimental knowledge to see the faithfulness of God and the unsatisfying comforts of the sublunary state, and also to realise that all things work together for good, that our afflictions are but for a moment when we compare them to the eternal joys that await the children of God in the heavenly kingdom above. Our Lord doth not afflict us but for our good, and His love will not depart from those that love Him. We may learn a few practical inferences from this subject:—1. Come what may, forsake not the Lord. 2. Satan will tempt the best of the Lord's people. 3. Pray that God may be with us. 4. God will not forsake His own. 5. God will reward the faithful. 6. Christ overcame Satan. 7. Jesus was tempted.—THOMAS HEATH, Plymouth.

THE Bishop of Manchester, presiding on Thursday at the annual meeting of the various diocesan societies, was sorry to find that there had been a decrease of £198 in the Diocesan Sunday Fund, and still more sorry to discover that the most serious falling-off was in important churches. He was also sorry to find that most of the forty-nine churches that had sent no offertory had received grants from the diocesan societies. He thought that showed what he must call ingratitude. The schools of the diocese had, they were sorry to know, very great difficulties to meet and overcome. They learned that 160 parishes had to provide additional buildings, or to make structural alterations, at a cost of £110,000, though they were glad to learn that

nearly £50 000 could be raised in the districts where the needs existed.

AT Uppingham the following have been recommended for entrance scholarships:—D. H. Clarke, W. H. K. Smith, A. Jelf-Revely, J. G. Brown H. R. A. Hunt, R. G. M'Laughlin. Rutland Scholarships—H. S. V. Hodge and A. C. Norman.

AT Oakham School house Scholarships have been awarded to Fisher (Mr. Lea's, Higham), Mawson (Mr. Pridden's, Felixstowe), Lamb (Mr. Lea's, Higham), and Levien (Mr. Morgan Brown's, Hunstanton).

PREFERMENTS AND APPOINTMENTS.

Anketell, Rev. Henry Kennedy, F., Vicar of Wootton-Bassett; Chaplain to the British Embassy at Constantinople.
Atkinson, Rev. John Todd, M.A.; Rector of Thornbury, Herefordshire.
Boyd, Rev. Sydney Adolphus, M.A., Vicar of St. Giles's, Norwich; Vicar of Macclesfield.
Clark, Rev. P. N., B.A., Vicar of St. John's, Tue Brook; Domestic Chaplain to the Earl Poulet.
Collins, Rev. J. T., Curate of St. Mary's, Lymm, near Warrington; Acting Chaplain to the 3rd Battalion of the Cheshire Volunteers.
Curling, Rev. Edward, M.A., Curate of Sidcup, Kent; Vicar of St. Leonard's, Downham, Clitheroe.
Dicker, Rev. Gerald C., M.A., Vicar of St. John's, Birkenhead; Acting Chaplain to the 1st Battalion of the Cheshire Volunteers.
Duncan, Rev. Norton F., Curate of St. Alkmunds, Shrewsbury; Organising Secretary of the Irish Church Missions.
Faulkner, Rev. H. J. H., B.A., Vicar of Milburn; Rector of Dufton, Westmoreland.
Firth, Rev. W. W. D., M.A., Organising Secretary of the A.C.S. for the North-Western District; Vicar of Patricroft, Manchester.
Gunning, Rev. Henry W. M., M.A., Curate of Wigan Parish Church; Acting Chaplain to the 1st Volunteer Battalion Manchester Regiment.
Hodgson, Rev. F. R., M.A., Rector of Frithelstock; Secretary of the Universities Mission to Central Africa.
Jennings, Rev. H. R., Curate of St. John's, Penzance; Tutor of the Theological College, Truro, and Priest-Vicar of Truro Cathedral.
Lindsay, Rev. A. S., B.A.; Rector of Cranford, Kettering.
Parker, Rev. J.; Rector of Catsfield, Sussex.
Pelly, Rev. R. A., M.A., Vicar of West Ham; Chaplain to Mr. Robert Barclay, High Sheriff of Herts.
Robinson, Rev. W., Curate-in-Charge of Ruardean, Forest of Dean.
Stowell, Rev. Hugh F. La Mothe, M.A.; Rector of Ovington, Hants.

CLERICAL OBITUARY.

Badgley, Rev. Charles Howard, at the Rectory, Castle Frome, Ledbury, Herefordshire, on the 7th inst.
Beaumont, Rev. M. H., formerly Vicar of St. John's, Lowestoft, at Denegarth, Tunbridge Wells, on the 6th inst., aged 75.
Brailsford, Rev. Edward, at Fordwich Rectory, near Canterbury, on the 29th ult., aged 85.
Cole, Rev. Thomas Henry, at Malling Deanery, Lewes, on the 4th inst., aged 58.
Johnson, Rev. Andrew, M.A., F.L.S., Head Master of St. Olave's Grammar-school, Southwark, at 5, Belmont-grove, Lee, on the 7th inst., aged 62.
Moore, Rev. William Burton, for forty-six years Vicar of the Parish, at Evington Vicarage, Leicestershire, on the 8th inst., aged 71.
Pyne, Rev. Alfred, B.A., Fellow of St. Peter's College, Cambridge, for fifty years Vicar of the parish, at Roydon Vicarage, on the 3rd inst., aged 79.
Thorpe, Rev. George Villiers, late Vicar of Thurlby-Bourne, at Brighton, on the 25th ult.
Thurland. Rev. Francis Edward, M.A., Rector of Thurstaston, at Thurstaston Rectory, on the 6th inst., aged 73.
Williams. Rev. Bennett, for thirty six years Rector of the Parish, at Bramshall Rectory, on the 29th ult.

FIRST REMOVE THE CAUSE.

MEN frequently worry and trouble themselves a great deal in trying to cure the symptoms of vital weakness' nervous exhaustion, and kindred ailments, instead of endeavouring to first remove the cause. This can be done by Mr. Harness' Electropathic Treatment without the aid of drugs. It is useless to tell sufferers to employ their minds and bodies in useful work and to forget their disorders, so long as the cause of their troubles is not removed. How can it be expected that when they are fatigued by the least exertion they can occupy themselves by studying, walking, or other exercise? Even in conversation they frequently lose the thread of it and repeatedly find their memory failing them. What can they do? Physic will not cure them—perhaps the leading physicians have failed to afford them any relief, and they have consequently become hopeless. It is to such as these that Mr. Harness' new combined Electropathic Belt and Suspensory is so strongly recommended, as, by its gentle but continuous action, invigorating electric currents are imperceptibly generated and conveyed direct from the spinal cord to the affected parts. It is this scientifically constructed and convenient appliance which silently but surely acts upon the vital organs, and removes the cause of the patient's disease, effecting a wonderful change in his health, character, and conduct, and speedily enabling him to return to his natural tastes and habits, and enjoy once more the full vigour of youth, with all its accompanying pleasures.

We may add that this perfect Electro-medical appliance is exceedingly comfortable to wear, gives wonderful support and vitality to all the internal organs of the body, prevents chills, imparts new life and vigour to the debilitated constitution, stimulates the organic action, promotes the circulation, assists digestion, and promptly renews that vital energy, the loss of which is the first symptom of decay. Its healing properties are multifarious. It stimulates the functions of various organs, increases their secretions, gives tone to muscle and nerves, relaxes morbid contractions, improves nutrition, and effectually renews exhausted nerve force. Acting directly on the system, it sustains and assists its various functions, and thus promotes the health and vigour of the entire frame. Besides these benefits, the mind is maintained in a buoyant, cheerful state, and every faculty is stimulated to the highest condition of intellectual strength.

Gentlemen who read the above announcement have only to visit London and call at the Electropathic and Zander Institute (52, Oxford Street, W.) to be convinced of the marvellous curative powers of Electricity and Mr. Harness' perfect methods of imperceptibly applying the current. The medical officers of the establishment are in daily attendance, and may be consulted free of charge either personally or by letter.

The Church of England Pulpit.

INFLUENCE OF CHRISTIANITY IN THE HEART, IN THE HOME, AND IN SOCIETY.

By the Most Rev. LORD PLUNKET, D.D., Archbishop of Dublin.

"There be many that say, Who will show us any good? Lord, lift Thou up the Light of Thy countenance upon us." —Psalm iv. 6.

THE subject which has been chosen for our consideration this evening is "The Influence of Christianity in the Heart, in the Home, and in Society." The choice seems to me a wise and a timely one. The question asked of old by many, "Who will show us any good?" is being re-echoed in these latter days by not a few. In elaborate philosophical treatises, in the lighter literature of fashionable magazines, in newspaper articles, in daily conversation, it confronts us at every turn. No doubt, we who are gathered here to-night can each of us answer in the Psalmist's triumphant words, "Lord, lift Thou up the light of Thy countenance upon us." But in so doing it is only right, for the sake of others as well as ourselves, that we should be ready to give a valid reason for the hope that is in us. Let us, then, hope and pray that the study of this subject may reassure our minds as to the Divine character of that true religion which we profess, and may we all be enabled, on leaving this cathedral to-night, to pray, more earnestly than ever before, that our hearts "may surely there be fixed where true joys are to be found."

And now, remembering the limited time at my disposal, I must not venture to indulge in intricate disquisitions, or to cast the sounding-line into profound depths. All that I can hope to do is, to suggest a few general principles which may, perhaps, be found helpful to some who, by inclination or necessity, will be led to pursue this inquiry at their leisure in all its manifold details. And, in the first place, at the very threshold of such a question, two objections may be found blocking the way.

I may, perhaps, be asked whether the truth of Christianity necessarily follows from the proof of its joy-giving power. I answer, not necessarily. Such a proof is only a part of the cumulative evidence whereupon Christianity is based, and it is only as such that I adduce it to-night. But if the gladness which it bestows be just what we might look for from a good God, and if it be just what the Author of Christianity promised to give, it so far at least contributes its sum to the mass of testimony which substantiates our faith.

But I can imagine a further and more serious objection. "You are about," it may be said, "to answer the question, 'Who will show us any good?' by proving that true religion tends to promote joy and to avert misery. Are you not thereby appealing to motives of abject fear and personal profit? How much better to dismiss these obsolete notions of an offended God and future judgment, and to forget self in the larger thought of an 'immortal humanity'! It is 'good,' not 'joy,' that the Psalmist seeks for. Morality, not pleasure, should be the end of true religion."

In reply, let me say that I most cordially accept the axiom that goodness, rather than pleasure, should be the Christian's aim. But it is just because Christianity has holiness for its object that it is able to promise the happiness which holiness involves. Whether the same can be said of the worship of humanity, which on near inspection would seem to have utility rather than morality for its end, I cannot stop to inquire. The subject has been well handled by others who have been able to deal with it at greater length. My duty is to show that Christianity at least is clear in this respect. It does indeed appeal to fear and hope. But the fear and the hope which it invokes are not selfish; not, certainly, in that invidious sense which implies the wrong or the neglect of others. The sinner is called upon to repent for the sake of others as well as himself. The saint is encouraged by the prospect of a joy which derives its chief intensity from the hope of its being shared with others.

Nor can it be said for a moment that the Christian's fear or joy ignores the claims of morality. Why, the very conviction of sin upon which such a fear is based recognises the breach of a moral law. Christianity tells the sinner something more startling than what is announced to him by some modern philosophers. It does not merely reproach him because he has offended against the order of the "Unknowable." Such a mysterious announcement might lightly, indeed, affect his moral sense. Nor does it rebuke him merely because he has not yet been developed by some process of natural selection into a more perfect stage of moral development. His answer to such a charge, could he understand it, would be, "I cannot help it." What Christianity teaches him is, that he has fallen, in the exercise of his own free will, from that standard of purity which is centred in Him after Whose image he was formed, from that law of holiness which, having its being above, finds its reflection in his own heart. This he can understand. This is a sentence which goes straight home to his conscience, and begets a fear which has morality for its very source.

Nor is this all. That same fear whose beginnings I have described becomes ennobled in its onward course, being daily transfigured from the dread of offending a righteous Judge into the filial fear of offending a loving Father.

And as with the Christian's fear, so with his joy and hope. Even in its beginnings the joy of him who feels that sin is forgiven, and that heaven is in view, involves a recognition of the moral law; for it implies that sin is something which must needs be forgiven if heaven is to be reached; but not only does this joyful hope take its rise from a moral source, it daily tends to further holiness. Such, at least, was the experience of the aged Apostle who, as the hope of meeting his Lord drew near its fulfilment, exclaimed, "He that hath this hope purifieth himself even as He is pure."

But I must not anticipate. I have said enough, I trust, to show that as with the Christian's fear, so is it with his joy. Both are essentially moral in their character. The fear is not the result of arbitrary threats; the joy is not caused by seductive bribes. The thought of goodness, and its obligations, gives them birth; the same thought afterwards glorifies them with a new meaning. Holiness thus rightly claims to be the end of the Christian's life; but happiness claims to be its inseparable condition. And when we speak, as we do this evening, of true religion as promoting joy, we are really describing one of the credentials which vindicate its Divine morality!

But having passed the threshold of our inquiry, we have still some further preliminary questionings to dispose of. Is this joy of which you speak, it may be said by some, really attainable? and if attainable, is it of any value? Is anything deserving of the name of happiness to be found in this world? In other words, "Is life worth living?" To this question the pessimist deliberately answers, No! And, as those among you who are acquainted with the philosophy of Schopenhauer and his followers are aware, this despairing view of life is at the present moment exercising no little influence in Germany and other parts of the Continent, paralysing energy among even the middle and lower classes to an extent that can be sensibly felt. As to Schopenhauer himself, I may say, in passing, it is only necessary to read his life in order to account, to some extent at least, for his pessimism. Never, I suppose, did there exist a man so puffed up by inordinate vanity. "He was penetrated," says a not unfriendly biographer, "with the conviction that he had been placed in a world peopled with beings morally and intellectually contemptible." "Study," he writes among his maxims, "to acquire an accurate and connected view of the utter despicability of mankind in general." "Sir," he said one day to a stranger who watched him attentively across the table, "Sir, you are astonished at my appetite. True, I eat three times as much as you; but then I have three times as much mind." And yet, notwithstanding this keen appreciation of his own talents—which, no doubt, were of a high order—he did not awake to fame until he was nearly seventy years of age, a few years before his death. Conceive the agony, to such a one, of this protracted season of humiliation, and then bear in mind the fact that he never was married, and had no loving wife to give him timely counsel or soothe his discontent; and have we not the elements of pessimism only too ready to hand? We must only hope that even the tardy recognition which his talents at length received may have tended to soften his angularities at the last, and, indeed to a certain extent, this may be inferred from his biography.

It is, however, the prevalence of views such as he taught that really claims our attention just now; and the phenomenon is all the more grave, inasmuch as it would seem to be the result of causes anterior to the influence of any one teacher, and larger far in its extent. Mr. Sully, whose work on this subject is the most exhaustive with which I have met, and who does not certainly regard the question from a Christian standpoint, traces the genesis of modern pessimism thus: "In its earlier manifestations, it was the apparent failure of a social and political ideal which brought about this state of despondency. In more recent years, the collapse of extravagant aspirations and endeavours of certain æsthetic schools has probably perpetuated, if it has not deepened, the pessimistic mood." He evidently here alludes, first, to those glowing visions of a future world-wide happiness which were pictured by the godless thinkers of the French Revolution, and by which even such men as Wordsworth and Coleridge were for awhile led astray; and, secondly, he would seem to refer to those equally Christless dreams of ultimate perfection, based upon the assumed progress of historical evolution, which were subsequently elaborated by certain German philosophers.

But why do I dwell at such length upon this point? Simply because the tragic reaction which has followed from the collapse of these revolulutionary hopes, and the bursting of these glistening philosophical bubbles, teaches us a lesson. It tells us that Christless pessimism is a natural oscillation from a Christless optimism; in other words, that to look for true joy in the heart, in the home, or in society, except as the outcome of true religion, is to build up hopes that can only end in despair.

Nor is such a lesson out of place at the present day. None of you, who study the signs of the times, can be ignorant of the fact that amongst ourselves have risen up some who profess to instruct us how to secure true joy without the help of true religion. I will pass by the teaching of those who advocate the revival of what they would regard as a modern Renaissance, characterised by a spirit of wild and utterly selfish, if not sensual, licence, which Mr. Pater, one of its prophets, euphemistically describes as a "noble antinomianism." This is a form of Hedonism which carries its reproach upon its face. I therefore turn to a more subtle danger. Let me quote again from the work of Mr. Sully, already referred to: "Once more," says

Mr. Sully, "through the new doctrine of evolution, as expounded by Mr. Darwin, and especially by Mr. Herbert Spencer, the modern mind has grown habituated in anticipating an indefinite expansion of human capacity in the future." The form of modern optimism here referred to is familiar to many whom I address. It is less barefaced than its predecessors. It does not require its votaries to ignore the idea of a God, though some avowedly do, and others express their theism in phrases too unsubstantial for the mind to grasp. Nor does such teaching exclude the element of so-called morality. Nay, its adherents seem nervously anxious to protest that they do believe in virtue, and take much pains to show how, without the necessity for any Divine inbreathing of the Spirit, a conscience can be evolved by the same laws, and, if only sufficient time be allowed, with the same ease as a mollusc!

This is a bold theory, these are high-sounding hopes; but theories as famous and hopes as splendid strew the past with their wrecks, and we can afford to pause and doubt before we base our hopes on this promised millennium of Christless virtue and Christless happiness.

And meanwhile, without going more deeply into the subject, we may, I think, appeal to common sense and ask whether the experience of the past is such as to warrant an expectation that, in a world like this a culmination of perfect virtue and perfect bliss will so easily be brought about, without Christ, simply by that process known as "the survival of the fittest?" For what means the survival of the fittest in the battle of life? It means, in plain words, "the survival of the strongest!" When, at the time of the French Revolution, liberty, equality, and fraternity were proclaimed aloud, the experiment of such a process was tried. All those religious, social, and political barriers that, in the opinion of some, had hitherto impeded the natural progress of this moral evolution, were swept away, and there was a survival of the fittest. But it was the survival of a Napoleon Bonaparte! Was this a triumph of morality? And what guarantee have we that history might not repeat itself in the future? I confess that I, for my part, see none. Perhaps it will be said that in so speaking I regard the question from a theological rather than an historical standpoint. Well, let me quote the words of one who does not profess to be a theologian, and whose opinion as to the weight of historical evidence ought to carry some weight. Mr. Goldwin Smith, speaking of what he calls "the unsuspecting complacency with which thinkers of the materialistic or the agnostic school seem to regard the immediate future," adds the following remarks: "They seem almost to think that, under the reign of evolution, natural selection, and the struggle for existence, the Sermon on the Mount will still be accepted as perfectly true; that the Christian beatitudes will retain their place; and that meekness, humility, poverty of spirit, forgiveness, unworldliness, will continue to be regarded as virtues." He then cites the history of the past as proof that there has always existed "a certain thread of connection between the eclipse of faith and the need of a government of force to keep men from mutual destruction and rapine"; and he then adds: "The worship of success, signally exemplified in the adoration of a character such as that of Napoleon, seems to be the morality of evolution supplanting that of Christianity!"

And now it is time to ask, What has Christianity to offer in the place of Christless optimism? What are the virtues and the accompanying joys to which it invites us? Let us consider the question dispassionately, and answer it without exaggeration.

It would be untrue to assert that morality and happiness cannot exist in any degree apart from Christianity. No doubt, were it necessary to measure the extent to which such a separate existence is possible, it would not suffice to point as an example to one who, though he had lost faith in Christian doctrines, had yet in early years imbibed Christian principles, which it was not in his power to cast away. Nor would it be enough to cite the case of one who, by the very necessity of his position, was unconsciously put on his mettle to uphold and practice the virtue which he claimed as an element of his new faith. No, we must try and imagine a state of society from which such modifying and restraining influences had been long banished. Allowing this, however, I still repeat that, even under such conditions, conscience would not become extinct; for is not the veriest outcast made in the image of God? Nor must we suppose that, even under such pressure, happiness would be expelled from the earth; for does not God rain some blessings on the unjust as well as the just?

And, once more, we must not assume that Christianity has promised to bring about, in this dispensation at least, universal goodness or universal happiness. The skill of the physician and the efficacy of his medicines are not the less because some refuse his help, or never really apply the remedy which they profess to use. So it is with the Great Physician. It is only to those who receive Him that He promises sonship. It is only to those who come to Him that He promises rest. Nor, again, does He promise that even they who come to Him shall enjoy perfect bliss. "These things have I spoken unto you," He said, "that in Me ye might have peace." "But," He added, "in the world ye shall have tribulation."

Let us not, therefore, look for more than has been promised. Enough for us that not one jot or tittle of that measure of blessing which He has promised to us as a present gift has been found wanting. Once assured of this, we can confidently expect that His promises of still greater blessing in the future will be found equally true. But, indeed, glorious beyond measure are the blessings even of

the present. Unspeakable beyond compare are the joys which even now true religion is able to promote in the heart, in the home, in society. Let us glance at but a few of these, and as we do we shall, if I mistake not, see that they are joys for which elsewhere we may search in vain!

Let us begin with the heart-joys of the individual Christian. I shall not dwell on those pleasures which the Christian shares with those who know not Christ, though, indeed, even these derive a new and holy meaning when irradiated from above. When, with mute entrancement, we contemplate the starlit depths of night above, or feast our ravished gaze on the manifold loveliness of the fair world spread out beneath, it does not lessen our joy—does it?—if, instead of tracing all this handiwork to the impersonal action of a blind Force, we look up with thankful love and exclaim, "A Father made them all!"—yes, and made them thus beautiful that they might make us glad! When music thrills our senses with its strains of earthly harmony, do those magic notes fascinate us the less because in the secret of their mystery we seem to find some foretaste of the unseen world beyond? And as regards those less sublimated pleasures that lighten the burden of daily life, am I not right in saying that they lose nought of their brightness when we know them to be illuminated and sanctified by a Father's approving smile?

But not only has true religion power thus to intensify those joys which are common to all: there are some joys which are altogether her own.

To confine myself still to those joys which have their special dwelling in the heart, let me speak of the power which true religion has to dispel those foul vapours which, as our Lord tells us, come naturally from within, and which are necessarily destructive of all inward joy. Here is a vital problem, which, so far as I can see, the newly-invented theory of a "tribal conscience" is utterly powerless to solve. For, as has been so well remarked by my friend Canon Smith (in his admirable little work on "Religion and Morality," published under the auspices of the Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge), a conscience which has for its basis nothing more than a system of social utilitarianism need not be expected to reproach a man for secret immoralities, however repulsive, if only they can be deemed not inconsistent with the general interests of the community at large. Now these are the very sins which conscience, as instructed by Christianity, specially condemns. It is not the outside of the cup and platter, but the very inmost heart, that Christ would have clean—clean enough to be a home for holiness, clean enough to be a home for joy!

But, again, true religion offers to the conscience the joy of pardon. I know that some would have it that Christianity has invented the terrors which it then undertakes to remove. But is it so? What mean, then, the innumerable blood-stained altars raised in propitiation of offended deities, whose smoke has gone upward from age to age, in lands where Christianity is unknown? What mean the admissions, with which you are all familiar, of heathen poets and philosophers, as to the retribution which sin entails, not merely as its consequence, but as its doom? Ah! if I mistake not, there are few hearts in which this looking for of judgment does not dog the steps of guilt. These secret transactions that take place within the heart itself, as it accuses or excuses itself from responsibility, are awfully real. Everything else that we see and feel in the outward world may be only a vision after all. But these inward misgivings, amounting at times to despair, belong to our very being, and cannot be shuffled off! Now it is for such misgivings that true religion provides relief. Did time permit, I should like to enlarge on the nature of this relief. Enough for me now to quote the first and last verses from the 32nd Psalm, which tells us something of the uncontrollable joy which pardon begets. I give the words in the full meaning of the original: "Oh! the happiness of the man," says the Psalmist, "whose transgression is forgiven, whose sin is covered!" "Be glad in the Lord, and rejoice, ye righteous; and shout for joy, all ye that are upright in heart."

But the heart-joy of the Christian does not end with pardon. There is the still greater and holier joy which he feels in the consciousness of being an object of love and care to a Heavenly Father, a sympathising Saviour, an abiding Comforter. No doubt he shares suffering with others, but even pain is accompanied at times with a solace, if not a joy, to which others are strangers; for it lifts his eyes upwards to One who overrules even affliction for his good. All that is evil in affliction comes, he knows, from beneath; but the blessing which accompanies it comes from above. No doubt, too, he has to share bereavement with others, but an unseen Saviour visits him in the hour of his trouble, even as He visited Mary and Martha of old. He shares infirmity and temptation with others, but an ever-abiding Paraclete is near at hand to provide a way of escape—talking of the things of Jesus, and and so bringing them home to his heart as to arm him with an unearthly strength. He shares with others the cold fear of death. But as the dark valley opens forth at last in all its gloom before his closing eyes he is not alone. There is One beside him to whom the trembling heart can turn and say, "I will fear no evil, for Thou art with me!" Nay, there can—yes, and there often do—spring up for him such unexpected gleams of light even in the midst of that darkness, that he can defy the last enemy and exclaim in triumph, "Death is swallowed up in victory!"

And if such be the joy which true religion brings to the Christian's heart, what shall I say of the Christian's home?

Let me, in the first place, say that in the eyes of

the Christian the very idea of home has a holy and Divine meaning that reaches far beyond its earthly significance. Those sacred and tender relationships that give to home its special joy have ceased to be regarded by him as the mere accidents of time and humanity. For has he not before his eyes the revelation to man of an Eternal Father and a Divine Son—of the compassion which that Father feels towards the whole family in heaven and in earth who are called after His name; of the sympathy which the Son feels towards those whom He is not ashamed to call His brethren; of the love which the same Lord feels for His spouse, the Church; of the household of faith here below; of the mansions prepared above; of the house not made with hands eternal in the heavens? These, no doubt, are terms whereby revelation tries to shadow forth the mysteries of the Infinite to finite minds. They are but gleams bursting through the rifted clouds that bar our further vision. But even so, they reveal somewhat of the brightness beyond; and as our earthly home reflects back their unearthly light, no wonder that it becomes invested with a new meaning and illuminated with a heaven-sent joy.

But not only does true religion thus consecrate the thought of home with a new significance; it also enjoins, with a terrible earnestness, those sacred obligations on the observance of which the happiness of home depends. The sanctity of the marriage tie, the honour due to parents, the bonds of brotherly love, the interdependence of the master and the servant—these are duties which true religion enjoins with no uncertain sound. And it does more. In the life of our great Exemplar, it presents us with a picture of One who, as a child, was subject to His parents, and who, in after life, though homeless Himself, did not seek the hermit's cell or shun His fellow-men, but went about bringing gladness to the homes of others—to the home of feasting, as at Cana; to the home of mourning, as at Bethany.

But there is, lastly, a further home-joy which true religion provides, and the thought of Bethany fitly suggests it. "Jesus saith to Martha, Thy brother shall rise again." Ah, here is a voice of comfort indeed! When, at last, the shadow of death falls upon some once happy home; when in the family circle some once-familiar face is at last missing; when the unspoken cry goes forth from each heart, Shall we see that face again?—then true religion whispers gently, Yes, you will! And with that message hope revives, and even joy dares once more to nestle down within the Christian's home!

It now remains for me to speak of the joy which true religion tends to promote in society. As regards society in its political aspect I shall not say much. Perhaps it will be enough to notice the fact that a chief source of happiness in a community is liberty, and that a chief friend of liberty is true religion. By liberty I do not mean license. I remember once reading a speech of Montalembert which left an impression on my mind. He was a man of liberal principles, and yet he desired to maintain the authority of the Pope, and so he combined these two elements by claiming for the Pope "absolute liberty." Now that is just what I think no man, or class of men, should be allowed. All that any of us can rightly demand is not absolute liberty, but liberty conditioned by the liberty of others. And this it is that true religion enforces. False religions have, indeed, not seldom lent their aid to tyrannies of the most hateful character—tyrannies of despots, tyrannies of mobs. But the religion of the Bible teaches quite another lesson. Who can read the Psalms of David or the Sermon on the Mount without seeing that it is the cause of the weak and the poor that is pleaded there? True religion is the champion of the oppressed, and if I were asked for an example, I would simply point to what was done by our own nation when, at the instance of a truly religious man, and acting, as I believe, on truly religious principles itself, it resolved, at an enormous sacrifice, to abolish slavery, once and for all, throughout the British dominions.

Here we have a positive example of what religion has done to further joy in society. It would be easy, did time permit, to show negatively how the absence of religion must tend to hinder liberty. I shall content myself with one remark. There are some who are looking forward with joy to what they believe to be the inevitable advent of democracy. Well, I do not stop now to ask whether democracy be a good or a bad thing. But this, at least, I would venture to say. Should democracy ever triumph, I do trust that, whenever it does, by that time religion will not have become extinct. For certainly, in that case, democracy will not mean liberty. It will mean anarchy—it will mean tyranny! Well worthy of attention are the following words of one who devoted the study of a lifetime to the consideration of this very question. Thus writes De Tocqueville, who, be it remembered, describes himself elsewhere as no adversary of democracy: "Despotism may govern without faith, but liberty cannot. Religion is much more necessary in democratic republics than in any others. How is it possible that society should escape destruction if the moral tie be not strengthened in proportion as the political tie is relaxed? And what can be done with a people which is its own master, if it be not submissive to the Divinity?" Again, he says: "For my own part, I doubt whether man can ever support, at the same time, complete religious independence and entire public freedom; and I am inclined to think that if faith be wanting in him, he must serve; and if he be free, he must believe."

As regards the influence of religion upon the social as distinguished from the political aspect of

society, I need add but little. What are the features which give special grace and happiness to the social circle? Are they not courtesy and unselfishness? And is not courtesy a Christian virtue? Why, the very quality of gentleness, from which the word "gentleman" is coined, was despised as a weakness until hallowed and exalted by the Sermon on the Mount. And as to its twin-virtue—unselfishness—surely it may claim a near relationship with that religion which tells man to look not only on his own things, but also on the things of others; and bids him do unto unto others as he would they should do unto him.

And now I must bring my remarks to a speedy close. I have endeavoured, God helping me, to describe the joy which true religion is able to produce in the heart, in the home, in society. I have tried to avoid exaggeration or misrepresentation. I have not speculated as to what religion might do, or ought to do. I have tried to confine myself to a truthful statement of what it has done and is doing. I have now one parting question to ask of those who deny that Christianity is a joy-giving religion, and denounce it, consequently, as a failure. I do not suppose I address any here who have come to this conclusion; but I will suppose that I am standing face to face with such a one, and I will put to him this question: "IF CHRISTIANITY BE A FAILURE, WHAT DO YOU PROPOSE TO SUBSTITUTE IN ITS PLACE?"

Let me explain what I regard as the importance of pressing such a question home, and demanding an answer. The position of Christianity, as regards its censors, often reminds me of the relation which a Government in office bears to the Opposition whereby it is assailed. I do not, of course, speak of any particular Government or any particular Opposition. What I have to say applies with equal force to all—Conservatives, Liberals, Radicals, Home Rulers alike. The position of those who are charged with the responsibilities of office may, I think, be thus described. Their policy is not merely sketched out in theory—it is not merely dangled before the eyes of the public in vague and fascinating generalities. It is seen by all in its practical operation. Those who are in Opposition have the luxury of criticising and promising; those in office have something far more serious and difficult to do. They must act. And of necessity they are thereby placed at an immense disadvantage. That which they cannot do becomes at once apparent. They cannot, for example, command a prosperous harvest at home or a successful campaign abroad. They cannot bestow their rewards on all or make everybody good and happy. Do what they may, there must be disappointment, there must be suffering, there must be discontent, and the discontented naturally lay all the blame upon them.

The more ignorant, thoughtless, and fickle of the people begin, without well knowing why, to long for change, and to lend a ready ear to those who conjure up splendid visions—sincerely, no doubt, for it is the nature of an Opposition to be hopeful—of what they could and would do if only the reins of power were once entrusted to their hands. And so it happens that visions of an unattainable perfection come to be believed in, and for a while they triumph. And at last the Opposition takes office itself, and is transformed into the Government. Then it is their turn to have their theories put to the test. And then the bubble bursts, and men begin to learn again the old, old story, that the magnificence of the unknown and of the untried may turn out on closer inspection to be a very sorry thing indeed at its best!

And now to look at this matter in its more serious light. Christianity, in this country at least, may be said to be now, as it were, in office. Its principles are being daily in the most public manner put to the test. Every one has an opportunity of seeing what it can and what it cannot do. We have this evening seen what it can do as regards the joy of the heart, the home, and society. And we have been able to compare what it now does with what other theories and so-called philosophies have not done when their promises were put to the test—when they, so to speak, were in office. We have seen how the brilliant dreams of revolutionary France, and the elaborate imaginings of speculative Germany, have not only ended in failure, but have produced a disastrous reaction by their fall. But Christianity is to-day confronted with a new rival. A new philosophy is now occupying the position of the Opposition, and is promising even greater things than those that have gone before. The gradual evolutions of a "tribal conscience"; a growing enthusiasm on behalf of an "immortal humanity"; the substitution of a blind Force for the idea of a personal God—these and other new developments of truth are able, it is said, to bring about that millennium of virtue and happiness which so many other systems, including the obsolete and delusive faith of the Christian, have striven to reach in vain! This sounds well, but let us remember it is only the promise of an irresponsible Opposition. To measure its worth we must try and imagine this new philosophy placed in office, and its theories put to the test. Yes, we must try and picture to ourselves Christianity altogether ejected from its present position—its churches closed, its schools broken up, its children no longer taught the sweet story of Jesus at a mother's knee, the ignorant and the outcast no longer sought for or cared for by the pastor, every good work now supported on Christian principles brought to an end, every Christian worker turned adrift, the Bible no longer seen in the hand of the little child or on the bed of the sick or the dying, the voice of praise silenced, the outpourings of prayer despised, and the thought of Christ as a forgiving Saviour and a sympathising

Friend banished for ever from every heart and home and community! Imagine all this taken away, and try and realise the dark, the joyless blank!

But we have a further picture to summon up before our minds. We have to imagine the new philosophy called upon to occupy the vacant place and to put its splendid theories to the test.

Imagine, then, its teachers now at length in office; not, be it marked, men like its teachers of the present day, whose early Christian education has left its lingering savour in their hearts, but men Christless from the cradle. Hear these teachers as they invite their hearers to the frigid ceremonies of Positivism, and try and make them devout and holy by urging them to love and worship an impersonal force, something they dare not describe as "Him," but only as "It." Watch them as they confidently undertake to make men moral by assuring them of the existence of a "tribal conscience," and to make men happy by reminding them of the joys of an "Immortal Humanity." Imagine, I say, these well-phrased theories that look so tempting in the fashionable magazine compelled at last to prove their worth as a substitute for a banished Christianity! Imagine the talented authors of these theories called upon really to meet the needs of the human race—not merely to sit down in comfortable arm-chairs and provide, by their writings, a literary treat for a few cultured and well-satisfied minds, but to find something to still the cravings of the universal heart of man—to bind up the broken spirit, to soothe the suffering, to comfort the bereaved, to reclaim the outcast, to give hope to the dying! Imagine, I say, this new philosophy of Christless optimism summoned, thus, to take into its hands the reins that it snatched from Christianity, and required to fulfil its promise: what think you would be the result? I will tell you!

Some of you have, doubtless, heard that wondrous opening passage in Mendelssohn's *Elijah*, in which the musician tries to represent the despair of a whole people perishing from thirst—a despair which finds vent for a while in sullen, restless murmurings, until, at length, gathering a terrible cumulative strength, it bursts forth, almost appallingly, in cries of heartrending and importunate agony! Well, so can I imagine the voice of a deceived and terror-stricken humanity—having sought in vain to slake its thirst at the dry wells of modern Positivism—sending upwards, at length, to heaven, the broken-hearted cry—"Give us back the Christ that we have lost! Away with the ghastly spectre that has usurped His throne! and let us learn again to love and worship a God who is heart to heart!"

My Christian friends, God grant that the need for such a prayer may never arise. But if we desire to avert such a disaster, let us hold fast the faith that is ours now. Let us not listen to the voice of the charmer, charm he never so wisely. To return to the thought with which we began. "There be many who say, Who will show us any good?" Let *us*, at least, be ever ready with the exultant answer of the Psalmist—"LORD, LIFT THOU UP THE LIGHT OF THY COUNTENANCE UPON US!"

SUGGESTIVE OUTLINES FOR TEACHERS AND LAY-WORKERS.—No. 5.—Abundant Encouragement: Read Eccles. ii. 1.—Introduction: The language of the text refers to the husbandman casting seed at proper seasons, in the East, after the rivers have overflowed and subsided, throwing the seed in order to gain profitable crops in the harvest-time. "Cast thy bread upon the waters with discreet industry and faith; thou shalt find it after many days." We may apply this passage of Holy Scripture to the earnest sower of the Word of God, viz., the preacher or Sabbath-school teacher. Cast the seed with all diligence and faith, and by God's blessing thou shalt find it after many days. He has promised that His Word shall not return void. Let us look at this subject briefly. I. *An Injunction.*—"Cast"—make an effort—"cast the net on the right side of the ship"—human effort. There must be obedience to this injunction. Our Saviour says, "Roll ye away the stone." Sow beside all waters. Follow the example of the Great Teacher. He always watched every opportunity for doing good to every one. II. *An Incentive for Doing Good.*—The present time is the best while it is called to-day. You need not doubt the amount of good which may follow. There is abundant encouragement for doing good. The seed may not in every instance bring correspondingly for the labour bestowed. Yet, according to the faith exercised and the prayer made when thus sown, the Lord will prosper and bless. There must be zeal, prayer, and faith. III. *An Encouraging Promise.*—When God tells us that we shall receive if we ask aright. Ask in faith. This ought to be enough. Our duty is then to trust Him, and thus leave results to Him. There is the promise: "Ye shall find it after many days." Our blessed Lord says, "Seek, and ye shall find." Alas! we have at times little or no faith. Hence so little prospers in our hands. It need not be, when there is demonstrative assurance in God's Word "that if we labour faithfully, and sow beside all waters." IV. *An Incentive to Faith.*—Shall the sower give up sowing if perchance the seed does not fall in good ground? It is a work of faith and labour of love. It may be the Master's wish that some of His servants may not see in this life the extent of their efforts—the fruits of their labours. There are many difficulties in the way. In order to continue faithfully in the Lord's vineyard there is great need of faith, patience, and perseverance. Notwithstanding, there are blessed assurances and promises in Holy Scripture to those who continue faithful to the end, in order to receive a glorious and imperishable reward. Then we shall see, perhaps, many in that blessed country who, while upon earth, took sweet counsel and turned to the Lord, through our faithful sowing and casting the seed, which fell in good ground, and one day hope to rise to meet those who have gone before, whom Jesus will raise again. (See Outline No. 3.) Then it will be all praise and glory to Him.—THOMAS HEATH, Plymouth.

NOTICES.

All communications respecting the Literary portion of the paper should be addressed to the Editor.

Business communications of every kind should be addressed to Mr. S. Gibbon, at the Church of England Pulpit Office, 160, Fleet Street, London, E.C., to whom cheques and Post-office orders for subscriptions (in advance), three months, 2s., six months, 3s. 6d., twelve months, 6s. 6d., are to be made payable.

The Cases for binding Vol. XXXIV. are now ready.

For Health and Immortality.

The Ecclesiastical Review.

SATURDAY, APRIL 22, 1893.

"TRADES UNIONISM."

THE hope we expressed last week has, unhappily, not been fulfilled; no settlement has been come to at Hull; and a labour struggle of huge proportions threatens. The result is easy to calculate. One more blow will be dealt at that long-suffering victim, British trade, and the prosperity of the Empire will advance one step nearer its doom. Its ultimate salvation or extinction rests entirely upon the public spirit of the masters, who have resolved to face huge and inevitable loss rather than sacrifice the principle of free contract, which is indispensable to commercial success.

There is, fortunately, every prospect that they will win, and the more because the party of mischief is now the party in power; and, however the rank-and-file may talk, the leaders know better than to put their wild ravings into action. But this struggle is going to teach a most valuable lesson; it is going to plainly publish abroad what "Trades Unionism" means.

First, the word "Trade" is a misnomer. This design of combination does not promote the interest of trade in any way; *i.e.*, it does not seek to improve the quality of work, or to facilitate distribution, or in any fashion at all to make for the mutual advantage of consumer and producer. A "Trade Union" is simply a combination of a number of workmen to make their work easy, and their pay secure, by keeping out other workmen, by restricting out-put, by depriving the more skilful and industrious of the advantages accruing from their gifts; by generally levelling down the standard to the gauge of the slowest and idlest. To do this the master and the consumer are treated as mere shuttle-cocks, as if they were not as important factors as the workmen in the commercial system. Hitherto the public has lightly regarded what appeared to be simply a struggle between employer and employed; but it is waking up to the truth that there is another party concerned—itself, and that in this triangular contest the "thirdsman" gets hit hardest.

And now light is being thrown upon the way in which the fallacy involved in so-called "Trades Unionism" is maintained. A day or two ago Mr. Keir-Hardie endeavoured to move an adjournment of the House of Commons on a question connected with the Dock strike. Only some half-dozen members supported him. On Saturday Mr. John Burns made the same motion on the same subject, and over one hundred members stood up on his behalf, including, save the mark, the entire Irish Party. What had happened in the two days' interval to change the minds of these honourable members? And what concern was it of the Irish members, who are well-known to be quite free from any taint of Socialism in their own private opinions, and are certainly not intimately concerned in any industrial problems. Those six-score men were moved by purely party considerations. While Mr. Keir-Hardie represents only himself, Mr. Burns is believed to represent enough votes to jeopardise Home Rule; and hence the support given to him.

And what did this honourable member propose to do? Simply to place Hull at the mercy of the strikers. Order having reigned in that town, more or less, owing to the action of the local authorities, and the strikers being deprived of their great weapons of brutality and intimidation, it was very necessary to remove the means of enforcing order, so as to ensure victory for the Trades Unions. This could only be done by getting the House of Commons to censure (virtually) the local authorities, and to order, or at least suggest, the removal of the troops and gun-boats. The plan is so transparent that one wonders any man of common sense could have adopted it, but agitators are not men of common sense.

Mr. Burns, however, had not reckoned with the Speaker, who is a man of common sense. The Speaker ruthlessly prevented the good man from referring either to the local authorities or to the troops, as that subject had been disposed of (unwittingly) by Mr. Keir-Hardie. And so Mr. Burns could only sit down; the object of his motion was frustrated, and we should imagine his feelings towards Mr. Keir-Hardie were not of the kindliest. For the present, therefore, the striker will not have his way at Hull.

But so much more light has been thrown upon Trades-Unionism during the proceedings that we cannot believe the deception will much longer be kept up. That its representatives should actually demand the backing of the House of Commons

and the Government of the Queen in their strife with law and order would be incredible were it not an open fact. Now it has been seen to be a fact, it must be made, if not incredible, no longer possible.

Reviews and Notices.

"Addresses and Meditations for a Retreat." By the Very Rev. R. W. Randall, D.D., Dean of Chichester, etc. London: Allen & Co.

The title of this work is a very sufficient description of its contents. The Addresses and Meditations which it contains have been composed and delivered by their author at some of those clerical retreats, which have become frequent, and (we may say) fashionable, among the clergy of late years, and of which he himself has been an able and successful conductor. His materials have been, with very slight exceptions, derived from Roman divines; and he himself confesses the debt which he owes especially to the Spiritual Exercises of Ignatius Loyola. We think that it will prove interesting to our readers, if we begin our notice by pointing out the resemblances and the contrasts between Dr. Randall's work and that of the famous founder of the Company of Jesus.

Ignatius Loyola, as both his disciples and his opponents will agree, possessed one of the most powerful individualities that have ever appeared in this world. Though of an intensely imaginative nature, a seer of visions and a dreamer of dreams at Manresa and elsewhere, yet he was one of the most practical of men, who saw his object most clearly, and knew how to adapt his means to the attainment of that object; and who, above all, was unrivalled in the art of handling men, and framing them into willing and devoted instruments for working out his ends. The object, which he had so clearly and constantly present to his mind, was single and yet threefold. Its highest point was to seek only the glory of God, as expressed in the motto of his order—*Ad majorem Dei gloriam*. Its second point was to think and act with the Church, which was for him the Roman Church (*orthodoxa, catholica, et hierarchica*), in which he had been educated, and whose claims he had never for a moment doubted, and to which he taught his disciples so entirely to submit their intellects, that if it had defined a thing to be black which to their eyes appeared white, they must at once pronounce it to be black.* Its third point was to expect, receive, and obey, as the commands of God, the orders of their own immediate superiors (*jussa Dei per superiores*), and to do this with no more resistance of the will than a corpse would have (*perinde ac cadaver*). In his own mind these three objects were perfectly identified; and, in influencing other minds, his aim was to produce disciples in whom his own ideal would be realised. His Spiritual Exercises were the great instrument by which he attempted, and often succeeded, in bringing about this result.

If now we compare Dr. Randall with Ignatius, we have no doubt that the highest point of the first general of the Jesuits is also his. He seeks in these Addresses of his "the greater glory of God." But, when we come down to the two other points, we find that these views no longer possess the definiteness of his great exemplar. It is true that he exalts the Anglican Church to which he belongs; and, no doubt, he imagines behind it a *consensus* of the Church Catholic, which he believes to be identical with the actual doctrines that his particular Church teaches. But the spirit of the nineteenth century has breathed on him, as well as on the clergy to whom he ministers, and it would be impossible for him to inculcate acceptance of ecclesiastical definitions, when they contradict the plain witness of sense or reason. And when he comes to the third point, and considers the clergy actually before him, though he tells them that they occupy the place of the electric wire, through which God communicates his spiritual gifts to man, yet he cannot feel that either they, or the bishops over them, can claim the implicit obedience which Ignatius Loyola demanded for the superiors of his order. Thus, however Catholic our author may fancy himself to be, he cannot escape from that Protestant position in which the events of history have placed us all. He may, as he does, persuade the clergy to live only to the glory of God, and in this he holds the first and greatest point in the object of Ignatius Loyola's mind; but beneath this he can only point to each man's subjective idea of Catholicism as his guide. For him, as for Cardinal Newman, in the midst of his assertions of Catholicism, the conscience must still remain the true vicar of Christ, whether the question referred to it be, as he himself would put it, What is Catholic? or, as the Protestant would put it, simply, What is true?

If we proceed further to compare the methods adopted by Dr. Randall, and by Ignatius, and by a third Person, whom we will not yet name, we find these to differ exceedingly. All three agree in this one point, that they recommend a retreat, in which those are to place themselves whom they wish to be influenced spiritually; but those retreats are of very different kinds. For Dr. Randall, they are assemblies of men, generally clergymen, collected at a place of meeting, where they employ themselves for a certain number of days in seeking spiritual improvement in company. A conductor is appointed, who delivers to them each day, at frequently recurring times, a series of Addresses, and so-called Meditations, in which not only the subjects which are to occupy their minds, but the thoughts that they are to think, and the feelings that they are to experience, are dictated to them. These are accompanied by religious functions, in which they all take part. Even their necessary meals are social; and, even at these, readings take place, to which they have to listen. Thus their whole time is occupied in social religious employments, and only the shortest intervals are left, in which they can think and meditate for themselves. Ignatius Loyola's mode of procedure was very different. Complete solitude was a necessary condition of his retreat. The person, whose mind was to be operated upon, was led to separate himself entirely from the world for a month, if possible, or, if too much employed in the common duties of life to be able to dedicate so long a time, then for a shorter period. During this time he was to retire into the most perfect solitude, if possible into a monastic cell, and to avoid all converse with any persons, except his spiritual director (*tradens officia*). This latter person,

* Ut Ecclesiæ cathoiicæ omnino unanimes conformesque simus, si quid, quod oculis nostris apparet album, nigrum illa esse definierit; debemus itidem, quod nigrum sit, pronuntiare. Ign. Loy., *Exercitia Spiritualia*. Regulæ ad sentiendum cum Ecclesia.

who was to be one experienced in guiding souls, was to act as a spiritual physician. He was to visit the patient daily each morning, and to prescribe to him the subjects on which he was to meditate during the day, the hours at which each spiritual medicine should be taken, and the chief points, but not the detail, of the meditations. These subjects were to be varied according to the spiritual constitution and character of the patient. And the whole treatment of the case was to be directed to an election or choice, that the patient was to be led to make, of some definite form of God's service in the world. The director was warned not to launch out into too many words, and not to suggest the ideas and feelings that ought to arise in the patient's mind and heart, but to leave these to spring up of themselves in the course of his solitary meditations. Ignatius saw very clearly that ideas and sensations arising thus spontaneously have much greater and more permanent effect upon the mind than those which are suggested or evoked by the words of a director. Thus the patient was left for nearly the whole of his time alone with God, and the spiritual physician only retained in his own hands the general direction of the thoughts.

But there is a third method of retreat, which is recommended to us by our third person, who was none other than our Lord Jesus Christ Himself, which was to enter quite alone into the solitary closet, to shut to the door, excluding absolutely all except the Father, who sees in secret, and who rewards openly, by bestowing the character and strengthening for the works which glorify Him. This sort of retreat our Lord, as we said, recommended, and this He Himself practised when He withdrew into the mountain, and continued all night in prayer to God.

Let us sum up in a few words the characteristic differences of these three modes of retreat. The retreat of Dr. Randall is a social meeting, in which a divine communicates his ideas and sensations, and in which those on whom he operates are but little left alone with God. The retreat of Ignatius is a long period of solitude, in which the subject is left for the greater part of his time alone with Him, but in which the human guide still retains the direction of the thoughts, and, so to speak, pulls the wires of the spiritual being. That of Jesus Christ is absolute solitude, in which no earthly being, not even a spiritual guide, is permitted to intrude between the soul and God. In the first kind, the result may be good feelings, good impressions, good resolutions, more or less vague, such as are produced under moving sermons, which these Addresses are. In the second, the result may be a firm resolution to devote oneself to that cause which the director has represented to be the will of God. The result of the third is an open heart, hanging upon Him who is not in temples made with hands, but around us everywhere, and who sends His graces, not through the electric wires of earthly men and material ordinances, but immediately, heart to heart, and almost face to face.

Thus much with regard to the differences between our author and his models. As to his work in general, it is pious, and no doubt sincere. For him, preachers are "orators of God;" and "celebrations," such as we witness around us every day, are not only decorously performed by our rector and his curates, and attended by the amiable, though rather commonplace ladies and gentlemen among whom we live, but also frequented by the angels of heaven, and by still greater Beings. He is very happy in thinking all this, and we have no doubt that all his transcendental ideas, and all his devout feelings, and even all his interjections, which are many, are like native plants to the amiable, affectionate, emotional, devout heart which it is his happiness to possess. But all high aspirations have their dangers, both to the person who relates and records them and to those who listen to their expression. They may become external even to him in whose heart they have originated; and they are certain to be external to a great part of the hearers. Devout expressions, which have once been genuine, are apt to degenerate into unctuous platitudes, even in their author, and to those who copy them at second hand they are seldom anything more. Thus it is that insincerity follows close on high spiritual flights. Our author might chasten his style by correcting it from that of his master Ignatius, who was neither unctuous nor interjectional, but very matter-of-fact; and if, when he is studying his other master, Jesus, he would, instead of piling up the horrors in detailed descriptions of the pains of crucifixion, consider, with a mind unbiassed by ecclesiastical tradition, what He was, and how He lived, and what He taught, and who were the enemies that caused His death, he would not press Him into the service of sacerdotalism, nor place an electric cable of clergy and ceremonial between His people and that Heavenly Father to whom His doctrine, His life, and His death have brought each one of them, whether lay or clerical, equally near. He would, in this case, see very clearly that, when Jesus the Christ had in His hands a person who desired to know how he should get nearer to God, He directed him, not to sacrifice or offering, not to temple or synagogue, not to priest or scribe, but immediately to that Father who sees in secret, and who is present everywhere.

One other point we desire to notice, which is our author's statement of the true object of human life, in which he agrees closely with what Ignatius calls his *Fundamentum:* "Our one work in this world is the saving of our own poor souls." If this be so, then the ideal at which men must aim is only another form of egotism, of selfishness. But it is not so. Man's highest aim is to eradicate out of his nature all self-seeking of every kind, either for this present life or for the hoped-for future one. Paul reached that point for a moment when he conceived the desire to be himself *anathema* for the sake of Israel; and Jesus of Nazareth wears the crown of humanity because, as we believe, He was unselfish always and in all things. And those have ever been the best, and greatest, and also the most influential among mankind, in whom, as in Gaudama and in Marcus Aurelius, there may be found some distant approach to this ideal. Before Dr. Randall conducts another retreat let him consider whether the true work of man is, not to save his own soul, but to live and to be as if he had no soul of his own, either to gratify or to save.

"The Handy Guide to May Meetings." Published by E. May, Fleet Street. Price One Penny.

This will be found a most useful little book for visitors to London during the month of May. It contains information of various kinds. It states the hours at which the meetings are held, and the places, also the principal places of worship, with hours of service; and mentions the hymns used in many of them. This little publication will also be found a guide to the sights of London, with cab fares, and it

tells the nearest railway stations to most places of interest. Being published at the small price of one penny, it should have a large circulation.

CORRESPONDENCE.

To the Editor of the CHURCH OF ENGLAND PULPIT AND ECCLESIASTICAL REVIEW.

MARRIAGE.

SIR,—The pronounced theories in your recent issue cannot pass unnoticed.

There is one stumbling-block which *primâ facie* is one that can in no wise be got over, viz., the financial side of the question. The maintenance of more wives than one with their families, could only be adopted by the wealthiest, and of these, the few who would adopt it could never make it "the fashion."

One of the signs of the decadence of the times is that monogamy is considered too expensive. I saw somewhere lately the curtailment of families advocated by Lady Florence Dixie in all good faith, and it has been long since taught, by the machinations of Mrs. Besant; this goes to prove the financial point would alone crush the proposition. But far from its developing morality, we should only have all the present evils of polygamy, and many more. Why not attack the radical cause of the disorder—the apotheosis of the animal in man. Plenty of men exist of like passions to the rest, but have got beyond that stage. Why not all? It is a matter of practice and education. Of all forms of idolatry, the worship of the animal in man has been the most fatal and degrading.

"Whatever a man soweth that shall he also reap.' The spirit of purity has been struggling through the ages. What glorious harvests followed in its wake! Our early Christianity, and the age of chivalry. The age of the Reformation with its martyred saints, and Shakespeare. Puritan England, followed by a galaxy of genius in letters, war and science, and—but enough of this, St. Paul has put it so clearly that "he who runs may read." "They who sow to the flesh shall of the flesh reap corruption." etc., etc.

We have reason to hope; for long there was silence—the voice was never heard—but now there are utterances from many sources and different quarters. The people that walked in darkness saw a great Light. After the long and weary night we may be nearing the break of day.

FIDELIS.

FALSE DOCTRINE, HERESY, AND SCHISM.

SIR,—I quite agree with Mr. Murphy in the second paragraph of his letter in last Saturday's PULPIT, except that I do not see exactly how it is an answer to what I stated, as quoted by him in his first paragraph. A saint of God that sins ever so slightly is to that degree a sinner. So it seems to me that one who holds any heretical doctrine, however unimportant the heresy may be, is to that extent a heretic.

Of course I use the words "heresy" and "heretic" here in their ecclesiastical, not in their proper and New Testament sense. It seems to me a strong recommendation of the words "heterodox" and "heterodoxy," instead of "heretical" and "heresy," that there is no word for the heterodox man to correspond with the word "heretic" for the heretical man, and I hope no one will ever try to coin one. The consequence is that people who differ from each other in doctrine cannot call each other names, however one man may imply or express his opinion that the other is so far heterodox as that he does not hold his "doxy," but something opposed to it.

However, this is really only a matter of *words*. As regards *things*, I am glad to think that Mr. Murphy agrees with me. I am also much obliged to Mr. Heath for his kindly approbation of what I have advanced on the subject.

May I venture to allude to another subject as to which I am much mistaken if nine-tenths of your readers will not agree with me. I mean your favourable notice of the Marquis of Queensberry's book advocating concubinage, and suggesting our adoption of one of the worst evils of Mormonism. I cannot but hope that the notice got into your review by mistake; at any rate I protest against its appearance in THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND PULPIT AND ECCLESIASTICAL REVIEW. Unless Lord Queensberry has changed for the better within the last few years, he is still, as he was some years ago, a rank infidel, if not an avowed atheist. We certainly do not want him, or the like of him, to amend the morality of the New Testament for us.

W. T. HOBSON.

St. Barnabas' Vicarage, Douglas,
April 17th, 1893.

[When the Marquis of Queensberry's pamphlet was sent to us we did not know or consider his antecedents. We were informed that it had been delivered before a large and influential audience, and as its sanitary, moral, and spiritual aims were undoubtedly excellent ones, we passed it on to our reviewer, a man of experience, judgment, and piety. He is not a clergyman, and we are sorry that he has offended the sentiments of our correspondent. In case he had found a word of infidelity or atheism, or of what was notoriously and admittedly contrary to the morality of the Old or New Testament, we are confident that he would have exposed and denounced it. On the question of divorce he is certainly at one with our Saviour's teaching. There are not a few doctrines and sentiments on social subjects which are said wrongly, as we believe, to be sanctioned by both the Old and the New Testaments, *e.g.*, teetotalism.

If Mr. Hobson can show wherein the teaching of this pamphlet of "Thelyphthora," or of "Hagar," is clearly contrary to that of the New Testament, we shall be happy to afford him space to do so, as it is a subject of the highest social, sanitary, and spiritual importance.—ED.]

PREFERMENTS AND APPOINTMENTS.

Belcher, Rev. Thomas Hayes, M.A.; Vicar of Bramley, Hants.
Bevan, Rev. William Henry Rawlinson, M.A., Director of Native Mission, Phoksana; Canon of the Cathedral, Bloemfontein.
Clutterbuck, Rev. E., B.A.; Vicar of Quinton, Gloucestershire.
Corfield, Rev. W. Ticehurst, M.A., Assistant-Curate of the Parish Church, Walsall; Vicar of Penkridge, Staffordshire.
Crosse, Rev. A. B., M.A., Canon of Norwich; Vicar of St. Peter's, Permountergate, Norwich.
Dawson, Rev. H. P.; Chaplain to the *Collingwood*.
Dolby, Rev. Reginald; Chaplain to the *Iron Duke*.
Ellis, Rev. S. J.; Rector of St. John-the-Evangelist's, Mafeking, Bechuanaland.

Foster, Rev. Prebendary Francis, M.A., Rector of Prendergast ; Chaplain to the High Sheriff of Pembrokeshire (Mr. Louis Samson).
Gillart, Rev. James, M.A., Vicar of Gentleshaw, near Rugeley ; Chaplain to the High Sheriff of Cardiganshire (Mr. John Francis).
Godwin, Rev. G. N., Vicar of East Boldre ; Vicar of Woodmancote-cum-Popham, Hants.
Hardy, Rev. Arthur, Vicar of Rampton, Lincolnshire ; Rector of Bampton, Derbyshire.
Haslock, Rev. Frederick ; Chaplain of the *Exmouth* Training Ship, Grays.
Heal, Rev. William Reece ; Rector of Chellesworth, Suffolk.
Hill, Rev. Frederick Charles, M.A. ; Rector of Shire (otherwise Sheire), Surrey.
Hodgson, Rev. F. R., M.A., Rector of Frithelstock ; Organising Secretary to the Universities' Mission to Central Africa for the West of England and Wales.
Holmes, Rev. William Perowne, M.A., Rector of Paston, near Peterborough ; Vicar of St. Peter's, Leicester.
Johns, Rev. B. G., Vicar of Woodmancote, Hants ; Rector of All Cannings, Devizes.
Laycock, Rev. John Marshall, M.A., Vicar of St. John's, Highbury, London ; Vicar of St. Peter's, Colchester.
Lloyd, Rev. Thomas, Rector of Bala ; Chaplain to the High Sheriff of Monmouthshire (Mr. Edward R. Jenkins).
Long, Rev. James Edmond ; Rector of White Roding (otherwise White Roothing), Essex.
Macy, Rev. Vincent Hardwick ; Rector of East Horndon (otherwise Thorndon), Essex.
Merrick, Rev. G. P. ; Chaplain of Holloway (with Newgate) Prison.
Owen, Rev. O. E., M.A., Rector of Flempton-with-Hengrave, Suffolk ; Chaplain to the High Sheriff of Suffolk.
Perkins, Rev. Thomas, M.A., Head Master of Shaftesbury Grammar-school ; Vicar of Turnworth, near Dorchester.
Pulling, Rev. Edward Herbert, Chaplain to the Forces, Aldershot ; Chaplain to the Forces, Canterbury.
Reeve, Rev. J. Andrews, M.A., Vicar of St. Just-in-Penworth ; Vicar of Addington, Croydon.
Robinson, Rev. Francis Watson, M.A., Vicar of St. Peter's, Leicester ; Rector of Paston, near Peterborough.
Sedgwick, Rev. W. Walmisley, B.A. ; Rector of St. Stephen's, Vryburg, British Bechuanaland.
Shipton, Rev. George, Vicar of Brampton, Chelmsford ; Rector of Grove, near Retford.

CLERICAL OBITUARY.

Biden, Rev. John, M.A., formerly an Assistant-Master of Marlborough College, at 61, Overstone-road, Hammersmith, on the 8th inst., aged 71.
Braybrooke, Rev. Philip Lansdowne Barry, at the Holt, Wokingham, on the 14th inst., aged 30.
Browell, Rev. James, late Vicar of Cowfold, Horsham, at South Nutfield, on the 10th inst., aged 79.
Crofts, Rev. Charles Daniel, forty-six years Rector of the parish, at Caythorpe, on the 15th inst., aged 71.
Davies, Rev. John Henry, M.A., late Scholar of Jesus College, Oxford, and Rector of Mount Bures, at Mount Bures Rectory, on the 16th inst.
Evans, Rev. Arthur, for forty-six years Rector of the parish, at Little Somerford Rectory, on the 9th inst., aged 80.
Hardcastle, Rev. Norman Capper, M.A., LL.D., of Downing College, Cambridge, at Harston, on the 14th inst., aged 34.
Hobbs, Rev. Stephen, Missionary C.M.S., and late Archdeacon of Mauritius, at 23, West-end Terrace, Winchester, on the 9th inst., aged 78.
Laxton, Rev. William, Rector at Oddington Rectory, Islip, on the 12th inst., aged 83.
Lovett, Rev. Robert, late Rector, of Caundle Bishop, Sherborne, at 20, Victoria-square, Clifton, Bristol, on the 12th inst., aged 80.
Meyrick, Rev. Edwin, formerly Vicar of Chisledon, some time resident at Amesbury, afterwards Rector of Alington, near Salisbury, at Boyne-hill, Maidenhead, on the 13th inst., aged 77.
Taswell, Rev. George, M.A., of Stonerwood, Petersfield, at the Lees Hotel, Folkestone, on the 8th inst., aged 71.
Williams, Rev. John Lewis, Vicar of the parish and Rural Dean, at Canford Vicarage, on the 15th inst., aged 61.

FIRST REMOVE THE CAUSE.

MEN frequently worry and trouble themselves a great deal in trying to cure the symptoms of vital weakness' nervous exhaustion, and kindred ailments, instead of endeavouring to first remove the cause. This can be done by Mr. Harness' Electropathic Treatment without the aid of drugs. It is useless to tell sufferers to employ their minds and bodies in useful work and to forget their disorders, so long as the cause of their troubles is not removed. How can it be expected that when they are fatigued by the least exertion they can occupy themselves by studying, walking, or other exercise? Even in conversation they frequently lose the thread of it and repeatedly find their memory failing them. What can they do? Physic will not cure them—perhaps the leading physicians have failed to afford them any relief, and they have consequently become hopeless. It is to such as these that Mr. Harness' new combined Electropathic Belt and Suspensory is so strongly recommended, as, by its gentle but continuous action, invigorating electric currents are imperceptibly generated and conveyed direct from the spinal cord to the affected parts. It is this scientifically constructed and convenient appliance which silently but surely acts upon the vital organs, and removes the cause of the patient's disease, effecting a wonderful change in his health, character, and conduct, and speedily enabling him to return to his natural tastes and habits, and enjoy once more the full vigour of youth, with all its accompanying pleasures.

We may add that this perfect Electro-medical appliance is exceedingly comfortable to wear, gives wonderful support and vitality to all the internal organs of the body, prevents chills, imparts new life and vigour to the debilitated constitution, stimulates the organic action, promotes the circulation, assists digestion, and promptly renews that vital energy, the loss of which is the first symptom of decay. Its healing properties are multifarious. It stimulates the functions of various organs, increases their secretions, gives tone to muscle and nerves, relaxes morbid contractions, improves nutrition, and effectually renews exhausted nerve force. Acting directly on the system, it sustains and assists its various functions, and thus promotes the health and vigour of the entire frame. Besides these benefits, the mind is maintained in a buoyant, cheerful state, and every faculty is stimulated to the highest condition of intellectual strength.

Gentlemen who read the above announcement have only to visit London and call at the Electropathic and Zander Institute (52, Oxford Street, W.) to be convinced of the marvellous curative powers of Electricity and Mr. Harness' perfect methods of imperceptibly applying the current. The medical officers of the establishment are in daily attendance, and may be consulted free of charge either personally or by letter.

The Church of England Pulpit.

WORLDLINESS.

By the Rev. J. E. WELLDON, D.D., Head Master of Harrow School.

Sermon Preached to Business Men at St. Margaret's, Westminster, on March 15th, 1893.

I THINK it may be said that all through our Lord's teaching He was more tender towards what are termed the great sins than to those sins which the world is accustomed to regard as only weaknesses and pretensions, or at worst the vices of respectability. To the publicans and sinners, to the Magdalene with her flowing tears, and the penitent robber on the cross, He was singularly indulgent. It would seem, on the other hand, that He was always hard upon the Pharisee, upon the lawyer, upon the men of hard hearts, and narrow souls, and cramped and limited sympathies. Perhaps we may see here an instance of His divine authority. At all events, the view which the Bible, from the first page to the last, takes of human nature is one which it would be difficult to understand being taken except under the influence of Divine illumination. Just suppose, for a moment, that human nature, unaided and unillumined, was the sole source of guidance, how strange it would be indeed that in the Bible human nature should stand condemned! If man has risen all his history through from one step to another out of barbarism into greater and fuller life, and if the Gospel of Christ were the mere outcome of worldly influences, why should it take so cruel a view of the world? why should the world be upheld as an enemy against which the Gospel inveighs? why should the Saviour, when going to die, warn His disciples so earnestly against the world? Brethren, the world is indeed an enemy of the Church of Christ and of Christian souls, and it is all the worse enemy because it is so subtle, so treacherous. To some extent human language itself is a witness to this antagonism between the world and the spirit. When we speak of "a man of the world," or of "worldly wisdom," or of "the sharpness of this world," we mean something different from, something opposed to, the spirit of Christ. And yet Christ forbade His disciples, even in that last solemn hour, to go out of the world: "I pray not that Thou shouldest take them out of the world, but that Thou shouldest keep them from the evil." He wished them to be in the world, and yet not of the world; they were to make their influence, their example, felt everywhere; they were to elevate and regenerate the souls of men among whom they lived.

That is what we have to do; and I know not how I can better spend the few minutes allowed me in this Church to-day than in asking you to consider with me what is the danger of the world as affecting our souls, and how we may best meet it. I speak to you, not as recluses, not as hermits, but as men of the world, occupied constantly in legitimate and honourable vocations, and yet conscious that there is a life above this world—an eternal, spiritual, divine life. You come here, men of business, you spare a fragment of your scanty leisure for divine things, just because, while living in the world, you believe, as I do believe, that "the lust of the flesh, and the lust of the eyes, and the pride of life is not of the Father, but is of the world; and the world passeth away and the lust thereof, but he that doeth the will of God abideth for ever." Whilst living in the world, and taking part in the occupations and professions of it, yet we wish to spend our days as in the sight of the invisible God. Will you suffer me to put before you two or three suggestions which, if they be adopted, may perhaps enable us, while living in this world, yet to rise a little above it?

And the first suggestion I would make is, that it would be well for him who desires the spiritual life to adopt some definite, constant action of self-denial. I do not set any undue store by self-denial. I think that such self-denial as impairs the force and vigour of the man is not a Christian virtue; but I have no doubt whatever that he who would live a spiritual life will find it useful to set before himself, to practice, and to continue some form of abstinence. I do not for the moment care what it is; but it would be well to abstain, not only from the things that are wrong, but from some one thing that is right. I do not intend to propose what direction that abstinence should take in the case of every one of us; I do not prescribe duties, I only lay down principles of duty. It may be abstinence from alcoholic drink, from theatres and balls—things perfectly right and legitimate in themselves; or it may be abstinence from marriage at the call of the Saviour, Christ; it may be even so small a thing as early rising in the morning, or it may be some pecuniary generosity; but whatever it is, if it be adopted as a definite self-denial, as a definite self-consecration of the man to God, it will undoubtedly have a purifying and elevating influence.

My second suggestion is this, that every one of us who desires to live the spiritual life should ask himself the question, In what respect does my ordinary life, my professional, my regular routine of existence, tend to draw me from God, tend to set God at a distance, tend to deaden the spiritual activities and faculties? and then that he should

set himself to encourage a practice which will limit this tendency. For, according to the familiar illustration of the philosopher Aristotle, if a stick is bent in one direction, and you want to straighten it, you must bend it violently in the opposite direction. Suppose, for example, as is quite likely, that one is engaged in the business of commerce, it is his object to make money, and this is legitimate in itself; yet, if he be spiritually minded, if he desire, whilst having his treasure upon earth, to have a higher treasure in heaven, he will not be blind to the fact that the occupation of making money does tend to set the soul upon earthly, and not upon heavenly things; it does tend, not necessarily, but in its nature, to set up in the heart another God than the true God, and he will make it his object, in order to remedy and redress this tendency, to encourage in himself a definite, systematic practice of generosity; he will aim at using his money, not as an owner, but as a trustee, so that by means of it he may make the world better, he may increase the happiness and joy of those less fortunate than himself. The outcry against men of wealth at the present day is wrong; the world needs men of wealth, but men of wealth whose souls are on fire with enthusiasm for the consecration of their riches to the service of God and the service of men.

Let us take another instance to show what I mean. There may be a profession to which we are called, which in its nature exalts and encourages the intellectual faculties at the expense of the spiritual or the moral. It is so with regard to the Bar. It is with no disrespect to that profession that I say that whilst it quickens the power of the intellect, it does not in an equal degree quicken the aspirations of the soul. Men who are barristers and who are engaged in forensic practice should be alive to this danger, and whilst they necessarily are often only too familiar with the darker side of human nature, they should endeavour not to lose belief in those devotional ministries and sanctities which exalt human nature above itself and make it almost divine. It is no accident, I think, that great lawyers of our own time have found a happiness and peace in the teaching of children in a Sunday School; they were aware that it is possible for them to learn in those schools a truth, a sacred truth which they could not learn in their own professional life; and every one of us, whether his profession be forensic or any other which tends to exalt the intellect and suppress the spirit, should not forget that it is his duty to minister to the poor and needy in order to keep his spiritual affections alive. He should live not as for this world only, for here every success passes away almost as soon as it is won, but he should live for the eternal city, whose Maker and Builder is God.

You will forgive me if I take a third instance to show the duty and beauty of this spiritual life. It is easy to get into the state in which the very being of God Himself becomes a doubt and a difficulty, and yet it is vital to avoid that state altogether and always. Is it not the case in public life that there are dangers which threaten the well-being of the spiritual nature—I mean the love of victory for instance, which is not the love of truth; indeed it is often opposed to the love of truth? The voice of the people is not the voice of God, it tends now-a-days to drown the voice of God. What can be the effect of the malice and uncharitableness which men display so often towards one another, but to make God seem distant, and as if He had no relation to the human soul? Anyone then who in the great and noble field of public life is anxious not to let his spirituality die out will be careful at times to retire into solitude to commune with His Maker and with his own soul, and he will cry out, "Lord, what wilt Thou have me to do?" Such a man will try always to live as in the sight of God, and for the sake of his Master, and for those for whom Christ died, will endeavour to give men credit at least for respectable motives towards other men, though he may disagree with their opinions. Such a man will not be blind, he will not be dead to the possibility that those who do not see as he sees may still be honest and sincere in using the sight which God has given them.

Brethren, I referred at the opening of my sermon to that last discourse which passed between our Lord and His disciples as recorded in the 17th chapter of St. John's Gospel. If you will refer to it at your leisure, you will find, I think, that I am not wrong in holding that there are three principles laid down for our guidance which have a spiritualising effect, and which, if observed, will prevent that secularisation of man's nature which is the danger against which I plead.

The first is fidelity—fidelity to duty all life through; "I have finished the work which Thou gavest me to do." After all in the present day, as much as at any time, the thing which tells is character. There are plenty of clever people—I sometimes think there are too many—but what the world wants, what England wants, is men of character, men of whom you know that they will not depart by a hair's-breadth from the line of honesty and rectitude; men, in short, who can be trusted. Give me such a man, and I know that he will be an honour to his country and to his generation, and that the world will be the better for his life.

The second principle is Unity. Is it not strange that the Saviour should employ the very nature of the Trinity itself as an argument for the unity of human souls, "that they may be one as we are one," be one in State and one in Church? Party spirit may be necessary, but it is an evil in itself, it is a waste of power; it is not the aim or the object of our Lord Jesus Christ, and therefore while pursuing the aims of party, we shall, if we are wise, keep our eyes fixed upon the possibility of

becoming one even as the Father and the Son are one.

Lastly, Sanctity. There is nothing in the world like holiness. It is that, if anything, which makes the life of man divine; and the Saviour, Who was the great exemplar of holiness, of sanctity, He it is who as His last word commends sanctity. But our sanctity must be disinterested; it must come not from the thought of self, but from the thought of others. "For their sakes," says the Saviour, not for My own sake; "for their sakes I sanctify Myself."

Brethren, can I leave with you any higher word than this? May Almighty God gives us grace to realise the value of sanctity, of a life unspotted from the world, the life which Christ exemplified, and which His true servants imitate; and may He grant us so to live in the present world, that we may not lose the hope or confidence of the world in which we shall see Him face to face!

THE CERTAINTIES OF AN APOSTLE.

By the Rev. GEORGE BLADON, B.A., Vicar of Higher Walton, Preston.

Sermon Preached in Blackburn Parish Church, on Wednesday, 8th March, 1893.

"We know that whosoever is begotten of God sinneth not; but He that was begotten of God keepeth him, and the evil one toucheth him not. We know that we are of God, and the whole world lieth in the evil one. And we know that the Son of God is come, and hath given us an understanding, that we know Him that is true, and we are in Him that is true, even in His Son Jesus Christ. This is the true God and eternal life."—1 John v. 18-20 (R.V.)

ST. JOHN was a very old man when he wrote these words—words that seem spoken in that tone of quiet assurance, which those only have whose belief has slowly broadened down during the calm of a peaceful, uneventful life, and whose opinions in old age are therefore as those of their youth, only ripened and matured.

Yet St. John's life had been anything rather than peaceful and uneventful, and the opinions, the hopes, the fears, the bright visions of his early years, had almost wholly passed away. To some extent perhaps this must always be the case, but as regards St. John it is even exceptionally true. For him not only had the old order changed and given place to new, but the new was not as the old, either in thought, or aim, or hope, or custom, or even creed. The world in which he was living as an old man, the little church at Ephesus, where he dwelt during the last decade of the first century, had nothing in common with that world—how far off it must have seemed!—in which he had lived as a young man—or with the Galilean home by the shores of the lake where the early years of his life were spent. Everything was altered; even things slowest generally to change had disappeared equally with those fleeting fashions of the world which are intended to pass away. For him, and for those like-minded with him, the law of their Fathers, the law that for so many generations had been so intimately bound up with every action of their lives, that it might almost be said to have become bone of their bone and flesh of their flesh, had gone, it had ceased simply by being fulfilled. The Temple itself, with all that solemn ritual which it would have moved Scribe, Pharisee, and even careless Sadducee to something more than wrath, to suggest even the mere possibility of their ever being done away, had been utterly destroyed; not one stone had been left upon another of that sanctuary in which God had once chosen to set His name. A national religion, so far as concerns its outward rites and ceremonies at any rate, was gone; and their downfall had brought with them to the ground those hopes and longings and desires which were nearest to the nation's heart. The longing for a free Judæa; the desire to be again a nation and to break the hated yoke of Rome; the hopes of a kingdom larger than even that of David and Solomon; of a dominion from sea to sea and from the river even unto the ends of the earth, and of a King whose name should continue as long as sun or the moon endureth—hopes which St. John had once keenly shared—were now seen to be unattainable. All had disappeared as completely as yesterday's sun beneath the horizon; and even in that new day which had dawned with the Sun of Righteousness, what changes there were. In those early days how bright the Church had been. Then the little band of believers had been all of one mind and of one soul—single-hearted, united, no one counting that which he possessed as his own,—what mattered lands or houses when the Lord whom they loved would soon return! To one, either St. John himself or a namesake, there had even been vouchsafed a glorious vision of the Church, as the new Jerusalem, the Holy City, the Lamb's Bride, adorned with precious stones, shining with the glory of the Lord God, and by whose light the nations should walk. That vision had vanished, or remained only as an ideal, experience had learnt to paint the Church in more sombre hues. Many deceivers had entered into the fold; heresies amongst their own selves had arisen; antichrists had come, there were already many antichrists, so that there was need to try every spirit. These were changes momentous enough, surely, to make the life of one who had lived amidst them all, anything rather than calm, peaceful, and uneventful—changes, too, of a kind that, reaching as they did to the very springs of thought and action, might have driven a weaker man into perplexity or even despair. One whose faith was not anchored within the veil would have written: We doubt,—not, We know:—not so St. John. He knew that although the outward and

visible frameworks of religion and society had been shaken to their very centre, yet there were inward and spiritual truths standing unshaken and secure; and surely also he must have recognised that he, the beloved Apostle, who once had leaned on the Master's breast and there had listened to what often fell dead on duller ears, had been spared through all this storm and stress, in order that in the calm quiet of his old age he might write down those truths, a legacy for the Church's use in the years yet to come. Already at the bidding of the Ephesian elders he had noted certain "memorabilia" of Jesus, the Gospel which records the first stages in that great conflict between light and darkness, life and death, righteousness and lawlessness, truth and falsehood, which in one sense ended in the triumph of the Cross, but in another sense still remains incomplete until the faith finally overcomes the world. That much had been done; and now in his Epistle we seem to see the aged Apostle again taking pen in hand to summarise for the benefit of the little children whose sins were forgiven, of the fathers who had known Him that is from the beginning, and of the young men who were strong and had overcome the wicked one, the leading ideas of the life once manifested—the words of eternal truth, the commandments not new, but old, and yet both new and old. And of these again, the summary, the conclusion of the whole matter is, "We know that whosoever is born of God sinneth not; but He that is begotten of God keepeth him, and that wicked one toucheth him not. And we know that we are of God, and the whole world lieth in wickedness. And we know that the Son of God is come, and hath given us an understanding, that we may know Him that is true, and we are in Him that is true, even in His Son Jesus Christ. This is the true God and eternal life."

Let us consider each one of these.

"We know that whosoever is born of God sinneth not, but He that is begotten of God keepeth him, and that wicked one toucheth him not."

Amidst so many changes this remained unchanged and unchangeable; that religion was still, as it always had been and always would be, tested by its effect—its permanent effect for good both on the heart and the conduct. Still, as it always had been, the tree was known by its fruits; character was the ultimate test of the personal reality of a creed. The initiation, the method might vary; it might be the call simply to trust and obey, as when of old Abram was called to leave home and kindred and go to a land that he knew not; it might be that continuous call of the law to self-discipline and obedience; it might be the trumpet cry, Repent ye, and bring forth fruits meet for repentance, which St. John himself once heard and obeyed, and which in a sense still echoes; or it might be the new birth of water and the Holy Spirit, which whosoever hath not is outside the kingdom of heaven, but in every case its reality was tested, not by proper observance of rite or ceremony; not by self-registration within any society, however select; not even by an intelligent appreciation of the importance of the subject, but by the cleansed heart and the changed life, by the obedience of faith, by the life regulated according to the claims of justice, mercy, and humility, by self-denial, and the cross daily taken up, and the Saviour daily followed. He, therefore, who had really—not nominally—entered that one flock, of which He that was begotten of God was the one Shepherd, had his whole being changed. That St. John knew, and therefore for such an one the habit of sin* had become impossible; for the wicked one had no hold on him: the misleading lusts of the flesh had been forsaken, and the guidance of the Spirit of Holiness accepted; the deeds of shame were now longer done, the fruits of righteousness were brought forth in abundance. St. John did not mean that the world, with its lusts and allurements and all its vainglory, never again defiled; he that had been once bathed would still need daily to wash his feet; but he did mean that the contented submission to evil, the willing acquiescence in wrong-doing, the habit of sinning, had wholly passed away. There might be—nay! there would be—the sudden fall under severe temptation, as when once St. Peter, in very peril of life, with oaths and curses had denied, or when all the Apostles, in darkness and fear, had fled; but more there could not be. For the plain words may not be explained away: "In this the children of God are manifested and the children of the devil; whosoever doeth not righteousness is not of God, neither he that loveth not his brother." The life is the test; we know it, in our hearts and consciences we know it; we know, even in such days as these, that goodness, and goodness only, is divine and eternal. In St. John's words, we know that "He that is born of God sinneth not, being guarded by the Son of God from the power of the devil.

And again: "We know that we are of God, and that the whole world lieth in wickedness." Just as the test was sure and abiding—the test of character—so also one dividing line stood fixed, even the division between the Church and the world, between the kingdom of God and the anarchy of evil. It might, indeed, be hard sometimes to say exactly where the dividing line ran; it sometimes seemed to include a Judas, and to exclude a Cornelius. Man might mistake in drawing it, but the Lord knew who were His; and that great division between those who stood the test of character, and therefore were within the kingdom, and evildoers, who, as such, were outside the kingdom, was in St. John's eyes the one division that really mattered. On each side, indeed, of that great division there might be minor lines of demarcation: within the king-

* οὐχ ἁμαρτάνει . . . . . οὐχ ἅπτεται, both present tenses.

dom some were Apostles, some prophets, some evangelists, some pastors, and some teachers; there were diversities of gifts, differences of administration, diversities of operations. The world, too, had its ranks and orders, its classes and masses, its rich and poor, the cultured and the vulgar; but these classifications did not affect the one all-important division between those "of God" and those who were of this present evil world. For thus, in plain words, St. John describes the world, and no thoughtful man, whatever his creed or no creed, will deny the essential truth of the description. Not only every theologian, but every statesman, every philanthropist, every teacher, every one who has to do with men, even every newspaper, testifies to the truth that the world is evil. The eighteen Christian centuries further testify that one creed alone, one society alone, permanently combats and overcomes the evil, and tends and cherishes the growth of the good—thus, therefore, approving both its Divine origin and also its claim to be the Church of the Living God. We know—yes! and the world itself knows too—that, despite its failures and its errors, the Church is of God; and the world itself confesseth that it lieth in the evil one.

And once again: "We know that the Son of God is come, and hath given us an understanding, that we may know Him that is true, and we are in Him that is true, even in His Son Jesus Christ." There is in this final word of certainty far more than only an emphatic statement of the doctrine of the Incarnation. True that the Incarnation is *the* event of all history, the great crisis of the religious life of humanity. Even if St. John had been looking backward to that only, the immense significance of the doctrine would have amply warranted his earnest witness to the faithfulness of the sure word of prophecy. But St. John meant more; he meant to testify to his belief that the doctrine of the Incarnation carried with it an all-important fact, even the fact of the abiding presence of Christ with His Church through the Holy Spirit. St. John does, indeed, look back to the fulfilment of prophecy on the first Christmas Day; but he also looks back to the further fulfilment, on the Day of Pentecost, of those words spoken in the upper chamber: "I will not leave you comfortless. I will come unto you; I will send unto you another Comforter, even the Spirit of Truth; He shall bring all things to your remembrances, whatsoever I have said unto you; He shall guide you into all the truth." And surely no other belief can compare in value for its power to help and strengthen those perplexed and harassed by all the burden of this unintelligible world; no other doctrine can be more "full of sweet, pleasant, and unspeakable comfort," than the assurance that in the abiding presence of the Holy Spirit, "the Son of God hath come and given us an understanding," by means of the continual guidance of the Holy Spirit, promised to be ever with the Church. A doctrine hard, indeed, at all times to be really believed by the timid, the anxious, the apprehensive; by those who do not clearly distinguish between the essential and the non-essential, between the eternal and the transitory; hard, perhaps, for all, in times like these, when so much seems unstable and insecure, when not only the value of the outward forms of religious worship, but also the truth of the inner realities they signify, are openly questioned; when the boldest dare hardly prophesy permanency for anything established, least of all for the Church as an establishment, when once again, it would seem, the very heavens and earth are being shaken.

But we have seen through what periods of change St. John had passed; yet he never doubted that, though God might move in a mysterious way, though clouds and darkness were round about Him, though His judgments were unsearchable and His ways past finding out, yet He would perform His wonders. He sat enthroned above the water flood; He reigned; what He spoke, that should be done; what He said, that should come to pass. The Holy Spirit had come, and therefore St. John knew—we know, if we have but faith—that the final triumph is certain, however little, in the smoke and dust of the conflict, we may discern the victory; and the Faith conquers and will conquer, though the words in which it is professed and the forms whereby it is held together may alter and vary, or even be found wholly unfitting. There might be seeming failures or defeats in this place or in that; a Sardis might have a name that it lived, and yet be dead; a Laodicea might be lukewarm, neither hot nor cold; tares there would always be amongst the wheat; iniquity might abound, making the love of many to wax cold; but none the less He who held the seven stars in His right hand would still walk amidst the seven golden candlesticks. The gates of hell should never prevail against the Church, for the word of promise standeth and would for ever stand sure: "Lo, I am with you always, even until the end of the world."

"Little children," St. John concludes, "keep yourselves from idols." From all that is vain and empty, from all that is transient and changing, from all that is shadow and show, from the lust of the flesh, the lust of the eye, and the hollow boast of a worldly life, keep yourself, and abide in Him, the true God, who only has the truths of Eternal Life.

THE Bishop of Shrewsbury (Sir Lovelace Stamer) has been presented by his old parishioners at Stoke-on-Trent with a portrait of himself, painted by the Hon. John Collier.

LORD RANDOLPH CHURCHILL, M.P., is expected to preside at the monthly meeting of the Church of England Sanitary Association, to be held at the Church House, Westminster, on Wednesday, May 3rd, at three p.m., when Sir Spencer Wells, Bart., will read a paper upon "A Sanitary View of the Parochial System of the Church of England."

NOTICES.

All communications respecting the Literary portion of the paper should be addressed to the Editor.

Business communications of every kind should be addressed to Mr. S. GIBBON, at the CHURCH OF ENGLAND PULPIT Office, 160, Fleet Street, London, E.C., to whom cheques and Post-office orders for subscriptions (in advance), three months, 2s., six months, 3s. 6d., twelve months, 6s. 6d., are to be made payable.

The Cases for binding Vol. XXXIV. are now ready.

FOR HEALTH AND IMMORTALITY.

The Ecclesiastical Review.

SATURDAY, APRIL 29, 1893.

MISGUIDED.

LAST Friday night ended in the House of Commons a Parliamentary farce, which may yet become a tragedy, unless the spirit of common sense inherent in the Briton saves us, as it has before. Anyway it is plain that the present Parliament is hopeless, quite past praying for. For the Gladstonian majority has developed that principle which is at once the strength and the weakness of the Anglo-Saxon race — the principle of unswerving, unshakeable loyalty and dutiful obedience.

In criticising the conduct of the majority, the Unionist press has not been quite fair to the English components of it, neither has its analysis been altogether logical. It is only natural that a measure affecting Ireland should be supported by Irish votes, and, whatever be the case with the leaders, the ordinary English M.P. has nothing to gain or lose by voting one way or the other. It is true that the Home Rule Bill has been carried, as far as it has gone, by a purely Irish majority; but if the entire Irish representation had voted solid, they would have been powerless if they had not been allied with some two hundred English gentlemen, whose character for honesty and uprightness is beyond reproach, and who have voted according to their conception of duty.

Here lies the rub. We regard the Home Rule Bill as the most pernicious political pest we have been threatened with this century. Its conception was disgraceful, its birth calamitous. It marks a step backward, it gives the go-by clean to all the progress of the world, and yet this large body of sensible Englishmen has voted for it. Why? Not because they have their own axes to grind, not because they have their own fads to flourish, or, *proh pudor!* their own pockets to fill. We do in all sad sincerity believe that there are members of the House of Commons who are swayed by these considerations, but only a shameful and miserable minority. The traitors, the mercenaries, the office-seekers, would, though told twice over, be helpless without the honest men. It is an unholy alliance, due to nothing but to that spirit of loyal obedience which dominates Englishmen. Men, not measures, is the principle of English political life; a certain number of Members of Parliament have recognised Mr. Gladstone as their leader, and they will follow him through thick and thin.

This is John Bull in his *berserk* mood, the mood which has made him master of the world, and will, sooner or later, ruin him. No people on earth will follow their leader like the English. Foreigners laugh at this quality, but they fear it. They hate our haughtiness, they jeer at our awkwardness, but they know that we are the most obedient, and the least obsequious, people in the whole world. That is why the English have stayed where foreigners have only touched. It is remarkable that while other nations have been before us everywhere, in Asia, Africa, and America, we have always in the end outstripped them. They have had the leaders without the followers; we have had both. Man for man, it may be granted that the heroes of England do not surpass those of foreign nations, except in so far as they have been better followed. But therein lay everything. The greatness of England has been built up by the strong, enduring, dutiful devotion of her sons.

It is a great quality, but it has its peculiar perils. Whenever catastrophe overtakes the English, it is through that generous confidence which they bestow on leaders sometimes unworthy of trust. We never began a war yet without reverses, because we always have to learn our experience, and the hardest thing to teach an Englishman is that his leader is not fit to lead—all the harder because he so often, by sheer pluck, amends his leader's errors, and turns disaster into triumph. Some of the most glorious achievements of our race have been desired, doubtless, but certainly not deserved, by our captains; occasionally calamity has not been averted, but the Englishman has been none the less determined, and even desperate, in his obedience to discipline and duty. The Frenchman shrewdly epitomised that grand English quality of self-less devotion—*C'est magnifique, mais ce n'est pas la guerre.*

And that is all we can say of the vote last Friday week. A certain number of English gentlemen have continued loyal to a leader, old and beginning to be discredited, but who yet retains a most commanding personality. Some of them are impelled by *esprit de corps* by the ties of long association and of mutual triumphs in the past; others are

overpowered by the glamour of almost mesmeric influence, by the fascination of unrivalled eloquence and an altogether indescribable personal charm; there is even a magic in old age, a kind of spell cast, as it were, back from the giants of the past and from the shadow of the tomb.

And so it is that though sorely damaged Mr. Gladstone's prestige remains pre-eminent. He still represents to many Englishmen the embodiment of all to which they owe devotion. That has given him his majority. While that endures his party in the House will no more question their leader's orders than did the men who charged at Balaclava, or stood to be shot on the field of Waterloo. They do not believe he can blunder, or, if they do, they do not care, for the Englishman is not of those who hold, with Solomon, that a living dog is better than a dead lion.

It behoves Unionists to remember this in future dealings with the Home Rule Bill. So long as a number of English M.P.'s believe it is their duty to follow Mr. Gladstone, it will be useless to argue about Home Rule. The only thing will be to stop it. In the Briton dutifulness is just stopped short at the point of fanaticism by common sense—that must be given time to work. To that end a dissolution must be forced. Mr. Gladstone must not be allowed to fix this spirit of devotion until it becomes too firm for even common sense to evaporate it. Nor must he be allowed to take advantage of the present temper of his followers to drive on his schemes. An agitation, for instance, against the House of Lords, may seem preposterous, and would be if it were directed by a rabble of *sans culottes*, Welsh and Irish. But those two hundred or more Englishmen are to be reckoned with and the spirit they represent. It should be remembered that even if you convince an Englishman you may not alter him. And it is quite likely that most sober-minded Englishmen might be inclined to side with the Commons against the Lords, irrespective of any considerations of party politics; even Unionists would in many cases be ready to think that the issue as between Lords and Commons involved a higher question of patriotism than the Act of Union.

Therefore Unionists had better not fall to thanking God for the House of Lords, nor let the Bill severely alone in the House of Commons. In the first place, let no effort be spared to open the eyes of Parliament and people. Secondly, let all that is possible be done to compel an appeal to the constituencies without the interference of the Upper House, so that the English nation may have one more chance of saying whether it will elect to follow Mr. Gladstone for better for worse for the rest of his days, or whether it has come to itself at last and has determined to withdraw for ever confidence now recognised to be misplaced.

We pin our faith to the common sense of the English nation, and confess that we would much rather see the Government defeated by their Bill being strangled in committee in the Commons than thrown out by the House of Lords.

THE RUSSIAN TERROR.

THE condition of Russia is the great cloud at present darkening the horizon of European politics. It is a terror to the Russian people themselves and a terror to the nations across the frontier. It is true that professions, probably more or less sincere, of a desire for peace continue to be made by the Czar and by members of the Imperial Family, but actions speak louder than words.

For many months, vast armies have been concentrating in portions of Russia, bordering upon Austria and Germany. Meanwhile the construction of military railroads, in the same districts, has been pushed on with unprecedented vigour. About nine hundred thousand soldiers, and nearly a hundred and fifty thousand cavalry horses, are now massed in various localities between Moscow and the western frontier of the Empire. Indeed, nearly the whole of the huge army of Russia is concentrated upon that particular area.

What can be the meaning of this? What is it evidently calculated to bring about?

Between the German Emperor and the Czar, most friendly professions of mutual regard habitually pass, but meanwhile Russia is sternly repressing the privileges and rights of her numerous German subjects; so much so, that the peoples of the two great Empires hate each other, in spite of the friendship of their respective Courts.

But in regard to Austria, there is no profession of Russian friendship, either towards its Imperial Family or its people. And it is near the Austrian frontier that the multitudes of Russian troops are being especially massed. This is ominous.

Meanwhile the internal condition of Russia is becoming almost intolerable, even to its own wonderfully patient people. They may well be named the Sclavonian, or Slave race, for they exceed even the American negro in abject submission to the most brutal tyranny. In Texas and other portions of the southern United States the negroes are manifesting symptoms of determined resistance against the cruelties of lawless lynchers and other white desperadoes. But in Russia the wretched peasantry and the poor Stundists and Baptists are victimised unresistingly by wholesale.

To make matters worse, vast physical changes are coming over the very climate and soil of Russia, mainly in consequence of the extensive and unwise destruction of the forests which, for years past, has been permitted to take place. The effect of this is that bleak dry winds, no longer warded off by the serried battalions of the trees, now rush over the once fertile Provinces, bringing permanent drought

and famine with them. Even the greatest rivers of the Empire, such as the Volga and the Dnieper, have become comparatively shallow of late, whilst smaller streams have disappeared. Huge sand-drifts now extend for many miles over regions not long ago blessed with a productive loamy soil and fruitful harvests. Large tracts of Russia are becoming as desolate as the African Sahara.

As is well known, the English Society of Friends, and some other benevolent people, have liberally contributed money and provisions for the relief of the starving peasantry of Russia. But owing to the grossest neglect on the part of the Government, things remain just as bad as before, or worse. The *Edinburgh Review*, in an article entitled, "The Penury of Russia," states that, even in St. Petersburg, the flour bought by the Municipal Council, for the wretched peasantry, was found to be adulterated with deleterious substances. If this was the case, under the eye of the Central Government, things much worse might be looked for in the Provinces. And that such is the fact, is evident from a painfully interesting paper (in the *Contemparary Review*), entitled "On a Russian Farm." The writer shows that the police and the district officials inflict most shocking cruelties and oppressions upon the miserable and helpless peasantry, whipping them terribly, and extorting from them, by threats and false charges, their hard-won earnings.

Nor, unfortunately, are the minor officials the only ones to blame. The head of the Greek Church, M. Pobedonostzeff, Procurator of the Holy Synod, has issued an order for the suppression of the Bible-loving, sober and virtuous Stundists, whom the drunken priesthood of the Greek Church hate and persecute. This order is being carried out with abominable cruelty upon men, women, and children. The violation of Stundist women seems to be a special practice amongst the Russian officials. It has been pleaded that the Emperor must be ignorant of such things. But the *Edinburgh Review* states that the Czar himself pencilled, on the margin of Pobedonostzeff's persecuting mandate, the words, "All measures for accomplishing this purpose must be taken!"

With their habitual absence of veracity, the Russian authorities steadily deny that they, or their subordinates, are guilty of persecution. And they even spread mendacious charges against the poor peaceful Stundists, whose very virtues make them hateful to their oppressors.

The Jews also are undergoing shocking treatment throughout Russia, by means of imprisonment, chains, banishment and ruin.

At a time when famine and pestilence are destroying many of the people, it is special unwisdom to persecute such industrious and useful citizens as the Stundists and the Jews. And when the rest of Europe desires peace, it is worse than unwisdom for Russia to maintain her enormous armaments, so burdensome to herself and to her neighbours. The *Edinburgh Review* appropriately observes: "Of all the abuses and anomalies to be found in Russia, this is the most extraordinary—a starving people, an exhausted exchequer, and a colossal military expenditure." No Power on earth has the slightest interest or intention to attack Russia. Her territory is practically unassailable. Such an army as her present one can only be needed to carry out a highly aggressive policy, which the Czar disclaims; but it is largely contributing to the oppressive military system in other countries, which is the curse of our times, and it causes the ruin of the people and the State."

Is it, as yet, too late for the Russian Emperor and his advisers to avert the doom and the retribution which their wicked course of action naturally tends to bring upon them and upon their pitiable people?

SUGGESTIVE OUTLINES FOR TEACHERS AND LAY WORKERS, No. 6.—Christ the Bread of Life. Read St. John vi. 26-40.—Life was certainly given by Christ, for all things were made and created by Him. All things had life only through Him. He gave at the beginning life and light when this present universe was in a state of chaos. When He came to this earth of ours He brought us light, for man was in moral darkness; He therefore gave *light and life to the soul.* Christ is able to give all spiritual longings to the soul. The soul cannot obtain satisfaction from the things of this sublunary existence, There is nothing constituted in things terrestrial to satisfy the soul, for the better part of man needs something far above earth. Eternal life, eternal existence, is of the highest importance to mortals destined for immortality; it is, therefore, essential and absolutely necessary that eternal life is secured, *and it is only* to be obtained by Christ. He alone made salvation perfect when He came to our rescue; He therefore is able to give *eternal life*, of which His dear people will indeed be inheritors to a glorious immortality and imperishable crown. We may journey through this life and enjoy peace, although we may have many troubles, and even endure persecution; notwithstanding, peace will be the lot of those who follow His footsteps. Christ is indeed able to give food for the soul; there is no other that can do this but Christ; He is indeed the sustainer of the *soul;* if Christ does not feed us with His grace and wisdom, which is the life of the soul, we shall soon famish and eventually die (*i.e.*, spiritually), therefore it is highly important we ever look to Him for that food which cometh down from above. What a glorious prospect the Christian looks forward to when he leaves this state. There is the glorious anticipation of an enduring reward, and a glorious imperishable crown that will never pass away, never fade away. Then what a glorious hope the Christian looks forward to! Let us learn a few practical lessons:—1. *Life given by Jesus.* 2. *Longings of the soul supplied by Jesus.* 3. Life *eternal met by Jesus.* 4. Life and peace *come through Jesus Christ.* 5. *Living bread given only by Christ.* 6. Crown of life given by Jesus.—THOMAS HEATH, Plymouth.

CORRESPONDENCE.

To the Editor of the CHURCH OF ENGLAND PULPIT AND ECCLESIASTICAL REVIEW.

INSPIRATION, EXCLUSIVE OR NOT?

SIR,—I should not venture to trouble you with another letter on this subject, seeing that no reply has been made to my last, were it not that the recent publication of a "remarkable volume" (see the *Guardian*, February 22nd, 1893), happens *à propos* to endorse the wider and juster views, which I have been endeavouring to uphold in your columns. I allude to Bishop Westcott's "Gospel of Life," a work which epitomises the mature thought of twenty years' study and experience, at Cambridge, of our greatest living divine, and one which lays down the lines of a complete system of Christian religious philosophy. To all students of theology the ripe wisdom of the learned bishop cannot fail to be of interest; more than that, it is probable that, enriched with notes and references in future editions, the work will become a standard of philosophical Christianity, in opposition to the fashionable agnosticism and materialism of the day. At any rate, as one whose mutely eloquent guide, philosopher, and friend, the volume has been for some short time past, I trust you will allow me, in this final letter, to show the view which the Bishop of Durham deliberately takes on inspiration.

Now, Sir, to apprehend rightly his doctrine, we must follow the path of argument which he has luminously traced out. Beginning with the problems of life, which do not start from religion, but lead up to it, viz, "Self, the world, and God," each of these conceptions is beset with insoluble mystery, and yet they demand a practical solution at the peril of atrophy of our whole existence if we neglect them. Religion follows as a tentative solution of the problems of life. For religion is not an intellectual movement only, as Mr. Herbert Spencer would have us believe, when he defines religious creed as "an *à priori* theory of the universe"; it is not "morality touched by emotion," as the late Matthew Arnold said, for historically morality is of much later growth. Max Müller approaches nearer to the right conception of religion when he characterises it as "a mental faculty which independently, nay, in spite of sense and reason, enables man to apprehend the infinite under different names and under varying disguises." But, as Albert Réville pointed out in his able "Prolegomena of the History of Religions," there is a good deal in infinity which is abstract and which does not touch the soul, such as infinite time and infinite space. It may be added that any conception of infinity is a great deal too lofty for the childhood of religions. Réville's own definition is that "Religion is the determination of human life by the sentiment of a bond of union, uniting the human mind to that mysterious mind, whose domination of the world and of itself it recognises, and to whom it delights in feeling itself united."

Here we can see that, in the opinion of the learned French Professor, religion is the endeavour to solve and adjust the three great concepts of life already named self, the world and God. This endeavour, however imperfectly, fragmentarily and even falsely manifested, is not the property of one favoured race, but the attribute of mankind for the manifestation of man's nature, as originally religious, in the world. This is Bishop Westcott's view. He does not indeed give a single comprehensive definition of religion (see chap. iv.), but he looks at it from various points of view, and he arrives at the conclusion that, starting from the elemental problem proposed for solution, religion must, in its completeness, harmonise philosophy, ethics and arts, the true, the good, and the beautiful in one, and consecrate them in the Holy or fellowship with God. He claims that man has, by his original endowment, as made in the image of God, an affinity to Him, and that all our knowledge of God comes from God Himself. Man is born to worship just as he is born to speak. With Hegel the bishop has the sentiment of that continuous divine action, without interruption or weakness, of which the world is the theatre. Religion, with God underlying religion, is, in his philosophy, of world-wide comprehensiveness. Baring Gould said years ago what Justin Martyr expressed otherwise: "We erroneously suppose ourselves to be brought face to face simultaneously with a hundred different religions, whereas in fact we behold one religion in its transitory forms. It is hard to believe that Schamanism, Fetishism, Polytheism and Monotheism are essentially one, and yet comparative theology proves conclusively their identity." Complexity and divergence of beliefs need not startle us; nature itself, in all its variety, is formed practically out of a surprisingly small number of elements.

Now, Sir, having premised the humanity of religion, Bishop Westcott passes in review the great book-religions of the world, and shows how we can find—*e.g.*, in the religions of China—the thoughts of continuity and solidarity; in those of India the thoughts of Divine existence, emanation, and dependence; in Buddhism morality and self-abnegation; and in Zoroastrianism a close approximation to the doctrines of the Bible, the unity and holiness of God, the duty of right thought, word, and deed, future existence in heaven or hell, according to judgment at the resurrection, when a supernatural son of Zarathustra, a great prophet, would be born to awaken and judge the dead, to slay death, and to destroy all the works of the devils (chap. v. p. 190-2). No wonder that the bishop, unrestrained by that narrow yoke of bondage which weighs upon less generous and enlightened minds, looks upon Zarathustra as not unworthy "to be placed as a Gentile by the side of Abraham." He maintains that no student of the history of Judaism can fail to recognise the lasting efforts which Cyrus wrought upon the Jewish Church, and the services which Persia and Persian influence rendered to the education of the world and to the Jewish people. To that influence Judaism owes the disappearance of idolatry, the formation of their Church, the consolidation of their ecclesiastical system, and the opening up of fuller views of the unseen world. He avers that "the doctrine of the 'last things' is, perhaps, the most important contribution of Zoroastrianism to the original expression of man's religious consciousness," for "Zarathustra fixed the ideas of a heaven and a hell as answering to man's conduct in his time of trial on earth" (chap. v. p. 180).

It is unnecessary for my purpose to quote further from "The Gospel of Life." Its philosophy of religion rests on a wider basis than that of the late Rev. F. Tilney Bassett—peace be to his ashes—who, in his sermon on Michael, printed in your PULPIT, November 26th, 1892, knows of but one channel of revelation, and contemptuously dismisses the lofty doctrine of Zarathustra as "the dreams and delusions of heathen-

ism." To that parochial view of God I demurred as unworthy of Him. I had as lief listen seriously to the old Scotch woman, who thought that there were two only who would be saved, herself and the minister, but she had doubts about the minister. Surely it is high time to banish for ever such paltry ideas of God. He that made of one blood all nations of men, that they should seek the Lord, if haply they might feel after Him and find Him, Who is not far from every one of us, shall He not send His Holy Spirit to them that ask Him, of whatever nation they are? Is the yearning after God too common in the world, that, in the language of Scripture, when an earnest soul asks for bread, He gives him a stone? Is the fountain of His grace so readily exhausted, that He must needs be chary and dole it out reluctantly, like parish pay? Many simple-minded Christians apparently think so, as the sermon met with no protest besides mine. How much nobler are the words of Dionysus, the Areopagite, quoted with satisfaction by Bishop Westcott: "God, who is the cause of all, through excess of goodness, loves all things, works all things, sustains all things, and turns all things to Himself." He, at any rate, did not look at God through a microscope; he could understand what the Bishop so admirably shows in his book, that "God takes a large compass to bring about His great works," embracing no less than our whole humanity.

As Mr. Donaldson has taken no notice of my last letter, it is charitable to suppose that he is reconsidering his position, and perhaps undergoing penance for taking up too hastily the late Mr. Bassett's narrow mantle. I shall be delighted to hail him brother, spite the world's scorn, and strongly recommend him the careful study of Bishop Westcott's "remarkable volume" for the wholesome broadening of his views. Should, however, the impending fear of Home Rule in Ireland be the real cause of his silence, as a mark of sympathy, I will freely promise him the full weight of my vote and interest against it at the next General Election.

F. T. P.

MARRIAGE AND CONCUBINAGE.

SIR,—It is with very great reluctance that I respond to your invitation to point out wherein the teaching of Lord Queensberry's pamphlet, etc., so far as it is disclosed in your review of April 8th, "is clearly contrary to that of the New Testament." I sincerely hope that my doing so, or what I have already said on the subject, will not have the effect of promoting a discussion of it in your columns, which I venture to think would be extremely unprofitable as well as distasteful to your readers.

1. In the first place, I would remark, that in our Lord's time on earth, as well as long before and ever since, monogamy was the rule and custom among the Jews, polygamy having all but disappeared though once practised and sanctioned among their ancestry. It will hardly be maintained that under the Gospel polygamy was given any encouragement to return, or denied that monogamy, and that alone, was sanctioned by Christ for His disciples.

2. As to the polygamy of previous times "from the beginning it was not so." When marriage was "instituted of God in the time of man's innocency," it was that of one man to one woman. It is this that our Lord reverts to in legislating on this matter for His Church.

3. The Septuagint translators in rendering "they," a man and his wife, "shall become one flesh" (Gen. ii. 24), "they *two* shall become one flesh," gave the obvious meaning, though not a strict rendering of the original Hebrew. Their rendering of the passage is adopted by our Lord and His Apostle St. Paul in Matt. xix. 5 and 1 Cor. vi. 16. If, as some say, the seventy put "δυο" into Gen. ii. 24 with a bias against polygamy, then our Lord and His inspired Apostle adopted the bias and embodied it in their Christianity.

4. Monogamy had been long enough and firmly enough established in Israel in our Lord's day to have produced the evil effects which some people ascribe to it in Christian nations; and certainly there seems to have been abundance of immorality and harlotry abroad among the people. But neither our Lord nor His inspired Apostles suggested as a cure for these evils a return to the polygamy of past times. On the contrary, in the very face of these evils, He encouraged monogamy and discouraged polygamy, and made the bondage, if we may so call it, of the one man to the one woman stricter than ever by His forbidding divorce "except for the cause of fornication."

5. St. Paul directs, in 1 Timothy iii. 2, 12, that a bishop (or presbyter) and a deacon should be each "the husband of one wife." This, to my mind, plainly implies that others in the rank and file of the Church might possibly be the husbands of two or more wives, having been so when converted from heathenism. But it as plainly implies that Church officers, who were to be "ensamples to the flock," were not to be selected from such. This is a plain, though wise and considerate, discouragement of polygamy. It did not ordain that, as has sometimes happened in the mission field, a polygamous heathen must put away all his wives but one as a condition of being baptised; but it ordained that he must not be appointed a deacon or presbyter.

6. It appears from one passage in your review that the Marquis of Queensberry would "limit the sexual relationship to one woman at a time, and call it plural marriage." I do not pretend to know for certain what this means. Is it that a man should marry one woman, live with her for a time, and when tired of her cast her off and marry another, and then another and another, in like manner? Or is it that his dealings with his harem should be regulated by law, as the Marquis suggests? I am not sure that either of these would be any improvement on what has been practised at the Salt Lake; but I am sure that it would be no improvement on the marriage practice of the Christian Churches.

As to the relative proportion of the sexes, admittedly equal at birth and in childhood, becoming unequal in maturer life owing to the circumstances of modern society, would it not be better if your reviewer, and those who think with him, would direct their energies to the change of those circumstances into what would harmonise better with God's provision and God's ordinance? What they suggest for the cure of there being in England, as your reviewer says, "1,000,000 more marriageable women than men" would soon redress the balance with a vengeance, and with the same unspeakable results as obtain in all polygamous nations.

7. Though it is travelling outside my brief, I venture to call in question what your reviewer seems to lay down as the cause of prostitution and immorality, viz., the desire in most women to have children. I doubt if one woman in ten thousand has fallen from virtue through any such desire. I think it is non-

existent among prostitutes, and that the possibility of any such supposed desire being gratified is guarded against by such in every possible way. I do not deny the existence of that desire among women in general, and that the thwarting of it by men being, for one bad reason or another, averse to marriage may be the cause of much unhappiness to women in general; but surely the cure for that is to cultivate patience and resignation among the women who are affected by it, and to cultivate such purity and unselfishness among men as would make marriage desired, instead of its being dreaded by them, on the financial grounds alluded to in to-day's PULPIT by "Fidelis." There is, so far as my experience as a pastor and a surrogate goes, a much healthier state of things in this respect among the working classes than among the (so-called) upper classes of society. There are among the former very few unmarried men or women of twenty-five years and upwards—very much fewer than among the latter.

W. T. HOBSON.

April 22nd, 1893.

SIR,—I believe that nothing but evil can come of any relaxation of the laws of marriage beyond the strict Christian law. Certainly the example of America is not encouraging in the direction of divorce, nor that of the East in the direction of polygamy. All testimony confirms the belief that Asia is more impure than Europe; and I have been credibly informed that the moral atmosphere of the Mormon capital is, or was, so foul as to be unbearable to pure-minded persons. To think that laxer laws of marriage would make society purer is like the notion of some of the wilder Socialists, that if all rights of property were abolished, everyone would have enough and no one too much; or the notion of some religious fanatics, that if all Church organisations were swept away, men would be taught directly by God; or the notion of Rousseau and Godwin, that if the restraint of law were altogether removed, men would show themselves spontaneously wise and good.

JOSEPH JOHN MURPHY.

Belfast, April 23rd, 1893.

BISHOP LIGHTFOOT ON THE AUTHORSHIP OF THE ACTS.

SIR,—A large instalment of the second edition of the "Dictionary of the Bible," which has been so much needed and so long promised, has at last been given to us by the enterprise of Mr. Murray. Among the entirely new articles which it contains few will attract more attention than that on the "Acts of the Apostles," by Bishop Lightfoot. The authorship of this book has often been discussed in your columns, and the paradoxical view has been maintained that both the Third Gospel and the Acts were written, not by a companion of St. Paul, but by St. Paul himself. Bishop Lightfoot discusses a variety of opinions which have been held as to the writer of the Acts, and decides unhesitatingly for St. Luke. He concludes this part of his subject thus:

"Apart from the hypotheses which we have hitherto considered stands the view propounded in H. H. Evans' "St. Paul the Author of the Acts of the Apostles and of the Third Gospel" (London, 1884). The Pauline authorship is maintained by this writer on the ground of certain resemblances of diction. He does not attempt to deal with the first person plural or to grapple with the difficulties which beset his theory on all sides." (Vol. I., pt. i, p. 33).

ALFRED PLUMMER.

Durham, April 23rd, 1893.

THE CHURCH PATRONAGE BILL.

SIR,—May I suggest a few considerations regarding this Bill?

If sale is stopped and private patronage continues, what will be the result? A patron of good livings, who is not himself a rich man—and there are many such cases—will be tempted to push sons and nephews, etc., into holy orders, with a view to providing for them with his livings. Nepotism is worse than sale, because a man who feels himself unfitted for ministerial work will not, in these days of his own will, seek holy orders at all.

The evil of sale is selling to unconscientious persons. Prohibiting sale will not make patrons conscientious. I could mention the names of earnest, hard-working clergymen, distinguished Mission preachers, admirable parish priests, successful Rural Deans, whose livings were "bought" for them. I do not defend sale. I only say it is better than nepotism—better often, too, than the odious truckling which takes place in certain neighbourhoods where trustee livings prevail.

Your correspondent, "London Vicar," sneers rightly at the "squarson" advertisement. Yet this is not worse than place hunting and toadying by ministers of Christ's Church.

By all means put a stop to unworthy ministers exercising their sacred functions. Above all, let Bishops be careful whom they admit to the holy orders of the priesthood. But do not attempt a partial remedy, which would only aggravate the disease.

Sale under the present system is the safety-valve; close it, and you create an evil which will prove disastrous.

PRESBUTEROS.

THE Colonial and Continental Church Society have appointed the Rev. C. T. Porter, D.D., vicar of All Saints', Southport, to the summer chaplaincy at Zermatt, and Canon M'Cormick, D.D., vicar of Holy Trinity, Hull, to the summer chaplaincy at Luzern.

THE Bishop of Capetown, Metropolitan of South Africa, is on his way to England, leaving Capetown by the *Drummond Castle* on Wednesday last. The main object of his visit to secure a coadjutor-Bishop for the diocese of Capetown.

PREFERMENTS AND APPOINTMENTS.

Bell, Rev. J. Allen, M.A., Vicar of St. Paul's, Southampton; Commissary in England to the Bishop of Columbia.

Bingham, Rev. Samuel Henry, B.A., Rector of Scampton, Lincoln; Rural Dean of West Lauress, No. 2.

Bromby, Rev. H. B., M.A.; Sub-Warden of the London Diocesan Deaconesses' Institution.

Burkitt, Rev. Henry John, M.A.; Licensed to Officiate in Stoughton Mission Church, in the parish of Stoke.

Chamberlain, Rev. Frederick William; Chaplain at Benares.

Cockshott, Rev. William Evans, M.A., lately Chaplain to the British Embassy at Constantinople; Vicar of Wootton Bassett, Wilts.

Cornford, Rev. James, M.A.; Perpetual Curate of Cainscross, Gloucestershire.

Cumberland, Rev. E.; Vicar of Quinton, Gloucestershire.

Dell, Rev. Robert, M.A.; Vicar of South Baddesley, Hants.

Gibson, Rev. John G., late Curate of St. Saviour's, Bamberbridge, Preston; Chaplain of the Netherton Reformatory, near Morpeth.
Green, Rev. Canon, Incumbent of St. Paul's, Port Adelaide; Incumbent of St. Peter's, Glenelg, Diocese of Adelaide.
Hardy, Rev. Arthur, Vicar of Rampton, Lincoln; Rector of Brampton, Chesterfield.
Hobson, Rev. John P., M.A., Tract Editor of the Religious Tract Society; Assistant-Minister of St. Cuthbert's, West Hampstead.
Hooper, Rev. William, D.D., Missionary at Jubbulpur; Examining Chaplain to the Bishop of Lucknow.
Hunt, Rev. H. B., M.A., Vicar of Tenbury; Chaplain to the High Sheriff of Worcestershire (Mr. E. V. V. Wheeler).
Langhorne. Rev. J., M.A., Head Master of the King's School, Rochester; Vicar of Lamberhurst, Kent.
Lawlor, Rev. Hugh Jackson, Curate of Christ Church, Kingsdown, Ireland; Chaplain in Edinburgh Cathedral.
Lonsdale, Rev. John Henry, B.A., Vicar of Wall, near Lichfield; Chaplain to the High Sheriff of Radnorshire (Mr. John Corrie Carter).
McSwiney, Rev. J. H. H., M.A., Rector of Barnoldby-le-Beck, Grimsby; Commissary in England to the Bishop of Columbia.
Nash, Rev. J. O., M.A.; Chaplain to St. Andrew's Community of the London Diocesan Deaconesses' Institution.
Newman, Rev. Charles H., M.A., Curate of St. Helen's, Gateshead; Rector of Hetton-le-Hole, Durham.
Nightingale, Rev. Robert Cubitt; Rector of Beechamwell, Norfolk.
Penfold, Rev. J. B. V., late Assistant-Master at King William's College, Isle of Man; Incumbent of St. James-the-Minor, in the parish of St. Peter Port, Guernsey.
Petty, Rev. H. M., Missions to Seamen Cnaplain, Plymouth; Vicar of St. Paul's, Tavistock.
Rainbow, Rev. E., B.A.; Missions to Seamen Chaplain at Great Yarmouth.
Rhodes, Rev. O., M.A., Vicar of St. Augustine's, Newcastle-on-Tyne; Vicar of Woodhorn-with-Newbiggin.
Richardson, Rev. B. G., Curate-in-Charge of Highfields, diocese of Brisbane; Vicar of Bowen, N. Queensland.
Samwell, Rev. F. W., Incumbent of St. Michael's, Mitcham; Incumbent of St. Paul's, Port Adelaide, diocese of Adelaide.
Sims, Rev. F. A.; Chaplain and Naval Instructor to the *Trafalgar*.
Sleigh, Rev. William, M.A., Association-Secretary of the Church Pastoral Aid Society for the North-west District; Vicar of Silverdale, Carnforth.
Smyth, Rev. Thomas Cartwright, D.D., Vicar of Far Headingley; Chaplain of the Convalesceut House, Coatham, Redcar.
Stead, Rev. Norman B., Curate of St. Luke's, Miles Platting; Perpetual Curate of Milburn, Newbiggin, near Carlisle.
Turner, Rev. Prebendary C. H., Rector of St. George's in-the-East; Rural Dean of Stepney.
Vinter, Rev. Alfred Evans, M.A., Principal of the Training College, Derby; Chaplain to the High Sheriff of Derbyshire (Mr. W. D. N. Drury-Lowe).
Watkins, Rev. James K., Diocesan Inspector of Schools in the Diocese of Carlisle; Vicar of St. Matthew's, Little Lever, Bolton.
Weigall, Rev. Spencer, M.A., Universities' Mission; Assistant-Missionary Thal'Nchu, Orange Free State.
Westcott, Rev. George Herbert, Missionary at Cawnpore; Examining Chaplain to the Bishop of Lucknow.
Whalton, Rev. Arundell; Organising Chaplain of the London Diocesan Deaconesses' Institution.

CLERICAL OBITUARY.

Barrow, Rev. R. J., at Elmhurst, Basingstoke, on the 16th inst., aged 73.
Doudney, Rev. David Alfred, D.D., late Vicar of St. Luke's, Bedminster, at Southville, Granada-road, Southsea, on the 21st inst., aged 82.
Edwards, Rev. E. F., formerly Vicar of St. Benedict's, Norwich, at St. Luke's Hospital, New York, on Easter Day, aged 51.
Haycroft, Rev. Isaac, B.A., Vicar of St. Chrysostom's, Peckham, S.E., and chaplain of Nunhead Cemetery, at Bow, North Devon, on the 20th inst., aged 63.
Theed, Rev. Edward Reed, M.A., Rector of Sampford Courtenay and Honeychurch, formerly Vice-Provost of King's College, Cambridge, at Sampford Courtenay, on the 21st inst., aged 80.

FIRST REMOVE THE CAUSE.

MEN frequently worry and trouble themselves a great deal in trying to cure the symptoms of vital weakness' nervous exhaustion, and kindred ailments, instead of endeavouring to first remove the cause. This can be done by Mr. Harness' Electropathic Treatment without the aid of drugs. It is useless to tell sufferers to employ their minds and bodies in useful work and to forget their disorders, so long as the cause of their troubles is not removed. How can it be expected that when they are fatigued by the least exertion they can occupy themselves by studying, walking, or other exercise? Even in conversation they frequently lose the thread of it and repeatedly find their memory failing them. What can they do? Physic will not cure them—perhaps the leading physicians have failed to afford them any relief, and they have consequently become hopeless. It is to such as these that Mr. Harness' new combined Electropathic Belt and Suspensory is so strongly recommended, as, by its gentle but continuous action, invigorating electric currents are imperceptibly generated and conveyed direct from the spinal cord to the affected parts. It is this scientifically constructed and convenient appliance which silently but surely acts upon the vital organs, and removes the cause of the patient's disease, effecting a wonderful change in his health, character, and conduct, and speedily enabling him to return to his natural tastes and habits, and enjoy once more the full vigour of youth, with all its accompanying pleasures.

We may add that this perfect Electro-medical appliance is exceedingly comfortable to wear, gives wonderful support and vitality to all the internal organs of the body, prevents chills, imparts new life and vigour to the debilitated constitution, stimulates the organic action, promotes the circulation, assists digestion, and promptly renews that vital energy, the loss of which is the first symptom of decay. Its healing properties are multifarious. It stimulates the functions of various organs, increases their secretions, gives tone to muscle and nerves, relaxes morbid contractions, improves nutrition, and effectually renews exhausted nerve force. Acting directly on the system, it sustains and assists its various functions, and thus promotes the health and vigour of the entire frame. Besides these benefits, the mind is maintained in a buoyant, cheerful state, and every faculty is stimulated to the highest condition of intellectual strength.

Gentlemen who read the above announcement have only to visit London and call at the Electropathic and Zander Institute (52, Oxford Street, W.) to be convinced of the marvellous curative powers of Electricity and Mr. Harness' perfect methods of imperceptibly applying the current. The medical officers of the establishment are in daily attendance, and may be consulted free of charge either personally or by letter.

The Church of England Pulpit.

THE RESURRECTION OF THE BODY.

By the LORD BISHOP OF GLOUCESTER AND BRISTOL.

Sermon Preached at Gloucester Cathedral, on Easter Sunday, 1893.

"Questioning one with another what the rising of the dead should mean."—St. Mark ix. 10.

ON this most holy and most blessed day the thoughts of the Christian teacher and preacher must, almost of necessity, take one or other two directions. Either they must bear him towards the contemplation of the circumstances, issues and consequences of his Master's Resurrection, or they must lead him to dwell upon what Scripture reveals to us of that on which the text tells us the Apostles questioned among themselves—the rising again from the dead in its general reference, and the nature of its true meaning and significance.

In reference to the first of these subjects, I have spoken to you somewhat fully and particularly on the last three recurrences of this Queen of the Festivals of our Church. Three years ago the revival in a modern dress of an old form of misbelief led me to place before you the truly amazing strength of the evidence for the certainty and reality of the Lord's Resurrection. On the Easter day that followed, we reviewed the powerful arguments which demonstrate that they who gave the evidence were neither deceivers nor deceived; and on last Easter-day we contemplated the power of the Lord's Resurrection, and sought to obtain some glimpses of the mighty working whereby, as the ages pass onward, the Redeemer of the world is subduing all things unto Himself. Having thus, I trust, fully considered our dear Lord's Resurrection, we may now, not unprofitably, turn to the other branch of Easter-day teaching, and reverently dwell upon some aspects of our future resurrection, and upon some of the consolatory truths that are brought home to us as we utter those blessed quickening words, "I look for the resurrection of the dead." Let us, then, briefly meditate this morning on that subject on which Apostles questioned among themselves, and endeavour to realise what we, with the fuller light of the dear Lord's own Resurrection, now understood by the rising again from the dead. To begin, then, this would seem to be certain, that the full meaning of the resurrection from the dead was not, at the time referred to, realised by even the very chiefest of the Apostles. And yet they had been permitted to behold a clear manifestation of the nature of that resurrection; they had seen with their own eyes and recognised, by what mysterious power we know not, two glorified saints of the past; nay, they had heard them with their own ears speaking with their transfigured Master, and yet it may be but a very short time afterwards these highly-favoured disciples were questioning, as the text tells us, what the rising again from the dead should mean. To account for such questionings when the real forms of Moses and Elias had only just faded away from their gaze, it has been thought by some interpreters of this passage that what they were questioning among themselves was not what the rising again from the dead was to be understood to be, but what meaning they were to assign to words which their Master had just uttered, viz., that He—He, their lately glorified Master, He, whom the voice from the cloud had declared to be the Son of the Eternal Father—was to rise again from the dead. Rise again from the dead? Why, could such a one ever die? This view of the questioning of the Apostles is ingenious, but the plain tenor of the words and the very circumstances of the case seem opposed to it. The Apostles had just seen the glorified forms of two men who had long since passed away from this earth; and questions at once arise. Had they been just called forth from the chambers of the grave, and would they return thither again? Or, had they been raised long since? And if so, how were they to reconcile this in their own cases with the rising again far, far in the future, distant and undefined, which was all they themselves could have looked for, a rising again from the dead—such as Martha believed in—at the last great day? This was the subject of their questioning among themselves. This present and perfected ri ing, these real and glorified bodies—was this what was really and truly to be the resurrection of the dead? In a word, it was the as yet unrealised truth of the resurrection of the body that was the subject and substance of all their questioning. Their Easter-day and its revelations were, for them, yet in the future.

If this be a correct view of the text the difficulty of the Apostles was substantially the same with that which was afterwards felt by some of the Corinthian Christians, and to a certain extent is now felt by many and many a Christian of our own days. The difficulty lies centred, not in the conception of a continued existence after death, but in the conception of a bodily existence when our present bodily existence—which observe, makes up the sum total of all that we know of such a form of existence—has come utterly to an end. When we first try to realise this rising again from the body, we find ourselves bewildered with anxious questions to which we can return no probable or reasonable

kind of answer. Persuaded as we may be that death cannot, and will not, be the end of existence,—however morally certain we may be that we must exist, if it be only to render an account of that existence to Him who gave it—however spiritually assured we may be, if we have any belief in Christ at all, that He who came to save us will never utterly forsake us—however convinced we feel of a survival of death, still numberless questions will press themselves upon us, such questions, for example, as these: When the body is perishing, when to use the significant word of the Apostle we are unclothed, what shall we be? And where shall we be? And if, as revelation tells us we are to be clothed upon, what will that be which will be thus clothed upon? And what will that clothing be?

Now in regard of all such questions, it may first be observed that we can know nothing save from revelation. Science can teach us nothing. It has not given us, and, we may confidently say, never will give us any hint or any indication, however faint, of anything on which speculation can even tentatively build. All it can tell us is that every few years we change, when living, every particle of our bodies; but as to the changes that may come to us when we have ceased to live, it is absolutely and utterly silent.

Secondly, let it further be observed that in respect of all such questions even Scripture is either silent or reserved. In all things relating to the state after death, when the body has been laid in the grave, and the soul is in its unclothed state, but little is revealed; and even in reference to that on which we are now meditating—the rising again from the dead—Holy Scripture mentions only the blessed facts of the future, but gives no indication of the manner in which they will take place. It teaches us plainly and clearly that we shall rise again with our own bodies; and it teaches us this by the great object-lesson that is ministered by God's book of Nature, by the seed that is placed in the earth and the plant that rises out of it. Our Lord Himself vouchsafes to use the illustration and an inspired Apostle develops it. And it remains, and ever will remain that which will most help us and steady us when we try to realise, in all its fulness, the blessed doctrine on which now we are meditating.

What this great parable of Nature teaches us as to the Resurrection of the body may be very simply set forth in two consolatory assurances: First, that the perishing of our mortal body is like the perishing of the grain of corn that is put into the earth; it sets free the germ that is designed to become the body of the future. We can find that germ in the grain of corn; we can behold it with our own eyes. Time itself would seem to have no power over it. The seeds placed 4,000 years ago in the enfolding cloths of the mummy have been found, it is said, to retain their mysterious germinating power, down to this very day. We can verify all this in the seed. We cannot verify it in regard of our own bodies. No hand, however skilful, can lay bare the resting-place of this germ in our mortal bodies. No eye can ever behold it; but we cannot doubt that it is here, in the body of each one of us, and that death will set it free to become, how, we know not, the body of glory or the body of shame, when the trumpet shall sound, and the dead shall be raised incorruptible, and we shall be changed. This is the first great teaching of the divinely-chosen parable of the Resurrection. The second is no less momentous and suggestive, and it is this: That as the planet widely differs in appearance and substance from the seed from which it sprang, so widely will the body that is to be differ from the earthly body—the body, as Scripture speaks of it, of our present lowliness and humiliation. "It is sown," the Apostle says, "a natural body, it is raised a spiritual body." The difference is vast and transcendent; illustrated, but only imperfectly and inadequately illustrated, by the contrast between the bare grain that was placed in the earth, and the seed-bearing plant that matures in the sunshine.

(*a*) This is the teaching of the great Scripture parable—broad, clear, and convincing. It answers only in part the anxious questions that will rise up in the soul when we dwell upon the mystery of the future body, but it answers all that we can profitably seek to know on this side the grave. Where the germ of the Resurrection body actually is, what it is, how it will be developed, whether it will be with the soul and spirit when the immaterial leaves the mortal and perishable, or whether it will be somewhere in the great treasury of God, reserved for the restorations of the Lord's Advent, it is not, in my judgment, wise or spiritually healthful even to speculate. That soul and spirit will be clothed hereafter with the body which we have been preparing for ourselves by the tenor of our lives, that this body will be incorruptible, and that in this body we shall stand before the judgment-seat of Christ, is the certain and indisputable teaching of Holy Scripture. All else rests on indirect statements, or on isolated passages, and on deductions from them which, in most cases, can only be regarded as doubtful and precarious.

(*b*) Not less precarious are, in my judgment, all attempts to draw special inferences from the Resurrection parable in reference to the second great truth which it reveals to us,—that the body which is to be will differ widely from the body that now is, and from the body that is laid in the grave. The fundamental difference, we know, lies in the broad fact that the Resurrection body will be a spiritual body; but what a spiritual body really is we can now form no adequate conception whatever. It may well be that this spiritual body, in some manner that we cannot imagine, may express the true personality of each one apart from all that might be accidental or transitory—that soul,

so to speak, will know soul, just as in the mysterious scene of the Transfiguration, the recognition by the Apostles of the two glorified "men" as Moses and Elijah was immediate, and plainly prior to any communication that they might be supposed to have received from our blessed Lord afterwards. But on these deep mysteries we do not presume to speculate. All that it is right for us to know, we know. We shall all be changed, but we shall all be ourselves; and, it does not seem improper to add, known to be ourselves, though how, we may never be able to imagine on this side the grave.

Such would seem to be the sober and meditative Christian's view of the true meaning of that on which the Apostles were questioning among themselves—the rising again from the dead—or, as they, after their Master's Resurrection, would indisputably have charactised it, the rising again of the body at the last great day.

We may now conclude; but let us not part without one plain and helpful thought, that anxious and perplexing as many of the questions ever must be that seem to force themselves upon us, as we meditate upon this great Article of our Faith—this certainly is true, that the doctrine of the Resurrection of the body is easy when viewed in connection with the Resurrection of the Lord,—that Resurrection of His holy body which we celebrate on this most blessed day. We here appeal to no parable, however helpful and suggestive. We appeal to a fact and to a truth. We appeal to a fact which, amid all the higher criticisms and semi-scepticisms of the day, is becoming recognised more and more as one of the most certain facts in the history of the world; that He who was laid by Joseph of Arimathea and Nicodemus in the rocky tomb, veritably and demonstrably dead, did on the third day rise with His own veritable body, and on the fortieth day ascend with that same body, sublimated and glorified into the heavens above, and in the presence of angels and men. This is the fact; and the truth that is eternally bound up with it is this: "Christ is the first fruits of them that are asleep"; and as it was with the first fruits, so shall it be with the great harvest of humanity. As Christ for us and for our salvation vouchsafed to be unclothed, and, in that mystic state, to pass into the waiting realm of departed souls, even so will it be with each member of the great human family that dies before His Advent; and even as He returned and took again the angel-watched body, even so will each one of us be called forth from the unseen world, and by the power of the Lord's Resurrection be clothed each with his own proper body, and in that body, imperishable and incorruptible, behold the Lord in His glorified body, and hear from Him the final award.

This it is—this union of the certain fact with the eternal truth—which forms the surest basis for the belief in a bodily Resurrection. How all this will be brought about when heaven and earth will be passing away, who shall dare to speculate? What aspect each risen body will present, whether the aspect of the earth life or some changed aspect arising from the soul-life in the unseen world, who shall presume to say? All this, an inspired Apostle tells us, belongs to the unrevealed, and to the deep and hidden things of God. "Beloved," he saith, "it is not yet made manifest what we shall be." But he adds blessed and assuring words which tell us that it is in our union with Christ (for I am convinced that it is Christ to whom the Apostle refers) that all will be disclosed and realised. "We know," he saith, "we know," for so he promised in His high priestly prayer, "that if He shall be manifested we shall be like Him; for we shall see Him even as he is." When we gaze on that adorable face all will finally be revealed. In our likeness to Him every anxious question as to recognition will find its answer; every doubt as to identity of person will be dissipated. We shall know, and we shall be known. It will then be no seeing with earthly eyes; no anxious perusal of half recognised lineaments; no passionate search for our own among uncounted multitudes. In our seeing Him, and in our union with Him, will all these heart-questions, which so often perplex and sadden us here below, find their ultimate answers, though how, may at present be to us inconceivable. Wherefore let us pray for a fuller and brighter faith in the power of the Lord's Resurrection, and in the ever-quickening blessedness of union with a risen Lord. Our questioning of what the rising again from the dead may mean will then bear to us its fullest fruit; and the reassurance that we often feel the need of when we closely meditate upon the Resurrection of the body will be ministered to us in its fullest measures. If we are truly united with Him here we shall be united with Him for ever. "If we die with Him, we shall live with Him": unclothed, or re-clothed, resting in the unseen world, or rising, caught up in clouds, to meet Him in the air, we shall be His: His life will be our life, "and so shall we ever be with the Lord."

THE Bishop of St. Asaph has, during the last five weeks, held confirmations at fifty centres in various parts of his diocese. The number of candidates confirmed was 3,230.

BY a recent resolution of the Central Committee of the Church Army, it has been decided to considerably lengthen the course of the evangelistic training. Owing to this very few married men will be accepted, and only those having very special and suitable qualifications.

ON Friday night, the 28th ult., the jubilee service o the Church of England Young Men's Society was held in St. Paul's Cathedral, nearly 1,000 members being present. The service was fully choral, and the singing was led by the choir of the Lay Helpers' Association. An eloquent sermon was preached by Canon Scott-Holland from Rev. xxi. 1.

OUR PARLIAMENT AND COUNTRY.

By the Rev. J. MARSHALL LANG, D.D.

Sermon Preached in Barony Church, Glasgow.

"It is not a vain thing for you, because it is your life." —Deut. xxxii. 47.

"PARLIAMENT"—you think, perhaps, that is not a word for Sunday evening? I think it is. Parliament has met; I think that this is a circumstance which Christian people cannot disregard. It may be meet to ask, in the first instance, What is meant by the word "parliament"? and to ask further, What is the fact signified by the phrase the "Imperial Parliament," "our Parliament"? The word is French in its origin, as a good many words connected with the Constitution of this realm are. It was first applied to the system of the Estates in France in the twelfth century. It means a "council," or an "assembly" *pour parler*—for talk; and our keen-witted and sarcastic countryman, Carlyle, called it the "Great National Palaver." The growth of the fact which this word denotes is one of the most striking and interesting elements in our history. Looking back to the far past, to the Saxon ages, when there were seven kings in what is now the one England, we see councils which were called the "councils of wise men," and which were convened, without any special royal authority, to discuss the affairs of the peoples. Then followed the Norman times, when the Feudal system was introduced, and according to that system the barons, greater or lesser, were bound to attend the Sovereign Council. At first there was only one Assembly, and that one Assembly combined both judicial and legislative functions. By-and-by there came to be two, and the legislative functions were mostly separated from the judicial. Under the Tudor and the Stuart dynasties the outline of Parliament became more distinct, and its power increased, until, as you know, in the great Civil War there came the sharp and terrible feud between the Crown and the Parliament. We come down to three dates that are of consequence. There is the Revolution in 1688, when the relative positions of the Estates of the Realm were distinguished. There is the year 1707, when this Northern Kingdom of ours was united to England. There is the year 1801, when Ireland also was united, and there rose up in grand and broad relief our Parliament, the one Parliament of the United Kingdom, with its three constituent parts, the Sovereign, the Lords, and the Commons.

Well, as I have said, it is an assembly for talk, and the talk is often discursive, and the talk is sometimes very wearisome, and the talk is occasionally very foolish. But the talk is intended to —if I may use a colloquial phrase—thresh out the subjects of national interest, and to secure that legislation upon them shall be intelligent, deliberate, and wise. It is said in the Book of Proverbs that "in the multitude of counsellors there is safety." Well, that element of safety is provided for, because between the two Houses you have more than a thousand persons who are presumed to be counsellors. If, again, it is good to have a check upon popular impulses, that sometimes develop into popular heats and frenzies, that, to some extent, is secured by the chamber which is not elected, and therefore not dependent upon mere popular caprice. If, once more, whilst there are many to talk, there is need of an executive which does not talk, of a controlling administrative power, that is secured in the Estate of the Sovereign. The system has grown, and round it, and about it, and through it, and into it there has grown a great mass of tradition. It does not recall a spic-and-span new villa; it recalls, rather—and surely this is meet for an old nation—it recalls a venerable, stately mansion, roomy and fit for use, some parts of it quaint, but all with the nameless beauty that gathers from long, long association. It safeguards separate interests, and yet it blends all the separate interests into a common interest. It realises for the most part a harmony, where there might be, and is, danger of friction. It compels and is the security of liberty for every law-abiding subject, whilst it makes law the shield above which there is none, under which there are all, from the highest to the lowest. No doubt there are faults, there are blemishes, there are imperfections. Every human system has these; but I have ever thought, and going travelling in America and elsewhere I have felt it all the more, that the freest Government in the world, the one which had mixed most of legitimate and sweet and wholesome expansions, which best reflects and best realises all that enters into the common good of the country, is that Government under which we to-night are assembled.

Well, we have met here this evening in the name, not of politics, but of religion. We are met as citizens of the Heavenly Kingdom, that Kingdom which claims us at the highest and the deepest sides of our nature. And yet let us remember that the heavenly and the earthly are not opposed. The heavenly to us is the earthly seen under the form of eternity. It is the ideal towards which the earthly is ever rising, or should be ever rising. Christ's kingdom is not of this world, but it is in this world, and this world should be of it. The very ideal is that sketched in the Book of Revelation: "The kingdoms of this world are become the kingdoms of our Lord, and of His Christ," and therefore, whilst all that belongs to mere party warfare has no place here, the enforcement and the application of the great principles, laws, conditions, and facts of social well-being have. Religion is not a department that is marked off from the life of man. It is not an island to which you sail on Sun-

day, leaving the mainland for an hour or so and then returning. *It* is the mainland. It is not an affair relating only to the next world, to the future. It relates to this present time: it marks a reverence which is to pervade all life, which is the soul and spring of all that is worthy in thought and action. As the old Hebrew lawgiver said, when he was urging the need of the national recognition of God and obedience to the words of the Law, "This is not a vain thing for you . . . . it is your life."

Now, that religion is the life is acknowledged and is embodied in the Constitution and in the institutions of our country. Our country—do you think that is a bit of geography merely, the islands of Great Britain and Ireland, with the colonies and dependencies thereto belonging? Or do you think that it represents a bit of geography, plus a mass of ratepayers, merely? Our country is a land of dear souls. It is a citizenship whose character, reflected on each citizen, has been formed through long centuries; formed through a history which has its black spots—some of them very black—but, take it all in all, a history that is noble and great. It is a citizenship with a duty to itself, to the world, to the God who gave the land to our fathers. There is in our country a perfect toleration. There is the most ample allowance for diversities of thought and creed. No person is debarred from the rights of the citizen on account of creed or of opinion; but in its wholeness the citizenship has a distinct religious impression. Parliament is witness for this, the ethical and religious idea of the nation. Each member, on taking his seat—unless he claims simply to affirm, which he is allowed to do—each member, unless he so claims, gives his pledge of loyalty, kissing the Book of the Law. Each day, before it proceeds to business, solemn prayer is offered to Almighty God. The Sovereign, as the representative of Government, as personating the essential truth of the realm, is bound by solemn oath to adherence to the Protestant faith, and to the precedence of the Protestant religion, as established by law; and thus, you see, there is not a mere covert, but overt, not a mere implicit, but explicit, not a mere abstract, but a most concrete and expressed tie between the State and the Church of Christ. The word of the old lawgiver is written into the Statute-book of our realm.

This is not a vain thing for the people; it is their life. This tie has been the centre-truth of the nation ever since the nation was baptised by Christianity. And the question is now brought very, very close to us: "Is this ancient tie to be dissolved?" Our country must tell our Parliament in some way what its answer is. I do not forecast the answer. I have a hope, I have a conviction of what it may be. I am not discussing just now, or here, the many issues that gather around it; but I only ask—and it is what a Christian man and minister may well ask of Christian people—that the ultimate and highest issue that is involved shall be one most earnestly and prayerfully considered. That issue is not the destruction of a privileged Church. I shall some time or other allude to the mere question of privilege. It is a very small question indeed, and one that only bulks large when seen through the coloured spectacles of sectarian jealousy. But there is something far, far more serious, and it is that with which I am occupied always. I do feel, I do most solemnly realise, that there is an issue the settlement of which will mark, if it goes in one direction, a parting of the ways from the past; the issue, namely, whether there is to be, by the act of the nation, an erasure of the pledge to God and the upholding of the Protestant faith from the Constitution of our country; whether the acknowledgment of the most high God and His Christ as Head over all things to His Church is to be torn out of the Statute-book, and the contention for which our martyrs bled, the contention of the crowned rights of King Jesus to the homage of the King and the nation, definitely expressed, is to be maimed, if not altogether destroyed. The Secularists, the Agnostics, the Roman Catholics say, "Yes." It is for a Christian people anxiously to ask whether that "yes" is to be re-echoed from street to street, from plain to plain, and from hill to hill in our land. I say nothing more than this. Let us pause, let us ponder, let us prayerfully and solemnly think it all over. What is done, or may be done, it will be impossible in any future time to undo, and the matter is at least one that relates to that of which the law-giver has said, "It is not a vain thing for the nation; it is its life."

Well, in the meantime, we look from our Parliament to our country, and from our country to our Parliament, and what do we see when we take the surroundings in view? We see times very hard and trying. The interest that, after all, lies at the very backbone of the country—the agricultural interest—is most seriously depressed. Our trade and our industry are wanting in elasticity and power of expansion. There is a growing permanence of the unemployed, and nothing is more touching than men willing to work and unable to get it. Men work for a little while; there is a glut, and then they are thrown out for long. There are adjustments—better, kindlier, happier adjustments—called for between money and labour. There are, we cannot disguise it, there are winds that are moaning, weirdly, heavily sometimes, winds that might possibly rise into hurricanes. God be merciful unto us, and bless us, and cause His face to shine upon us! We are not legislators—no; but we make the Legislature. We are part of the people to be legislated for. As is the people, so is the Parliament; and I think that it is a good word on a Sunday evening to say that each of us who knows the blessings that have been handed down to us through this Word, through our grandsires, through the solidarity of our nation, that each of us is bound to contribute a fair and honest quota to

the making of that nation be'ter. Every man or woman is called to have a right public spirit, to feel that there is a duty and a responsibility for the educating of public opinion, for the forming of a healthy national sentiment. Every person is called to be a thoughtful person; not to be led away by mere agitators, not to catch up mere party cries, not to take the cue from some organ of opinion; but to think, reflect, meditate, pray, and to understand that it is part of a religious person's life to look at every public question under, as the old Fathers used to say, under the form of eternity. There is not one of us but can help and can be of use, not one of us but can do something to rid our land of its deadly foes, and of that deadliest foe of all, that the Duke of Albany well said is the only foe England has to fear, the terrible dead weight and curse of intemperance that crushes out the very spirit of our land. There is not one of us but can help by being true, by being honest, by trying to make somebody better, beginning at his own home and working outwards, just as he himself or she herself gets better. Every one can be a good husband or a good wife, and good husbands and wives are good citizens. Every one of us can be a good Christian, turning the whole heart to Jesus Christ, and giving it to Him, and linking the life in its highest aspirations to Him, and so labouring, so living, so loving, so trusting, that it shall be felt that something is done for that which is no vain thing for any, which is the true and eternal life of all. God grant it for His own name's sake!

THE Bishop of Beverley announces that out of the 145 benefices in the archdeaconry of York thirty-nine are under £200 a year. Archdeacon Palmes reports that in 126 parishes in the archdeaconry of the East Riding the average income is little more than £200 a year; in thirty cases the incumbent has to maintain and educate his family, and support the schools and charities, on little more than a £100 a year; and, finally, there are eleven parishes where the stipend varies from £60 to £85 a year.

WE are requested to state that several clergy, with only small parishes in various dioceses, have undertaken to act for the Church Army as honorary diocesan organising secretaries; but this society is still unrepresented in the following dioceses:—Bath and Wells, Canterbury, Carlisle, Chester, Durham, Edinburgh, Lichfield, Manchester, Norwich, Peterborough, Rochester, Ripon, Salisbury, St. Alban's, Truro, Winchester.

THE Bishop of Winchester has returned from the Channel Islands, where he held five confirmations and preached. On his return home, during a sudden lurch of the ship in a heavy sea, he fell suddenly and violently upon his weak arm, which gave it a serious strain, accompanied by some fever. He is not allowed to leave his room for a few days, which prevents him, much to his disappointment, from being present in Convocation this week.

NOTICES.

All communications respecting the Literary portion of the paper should be addressed to the Editor.

Business communications of every kind should be addressed to Mr. S. GIBBON, at the CHURCH OF ENGLAND PULPIT Office, 160, Fleet Street, London, E.C., to whom cheques and Post-office orders for subscriptions (in advance), three months, 2s., six months, 3s. 6d., twelve months, 6s. 6d., are to be made payable.

The Cases for binding Vol. XXXIV. are now ready.

FOR HEALTH AND IMMORTALITY.

The Ecclesiastical Review.

SATURDAY, MAY 6, 1893.

AN APOLOGETIC BISHOP.

THE *Liverpool Daily Post* has published a very remarkable correspondence between the Bishop of Liverpool and one of his clergy. Here are the facts.

The clergyman, Mr. Herring, warned his congregation against attending a Unitarian place of worship, describing it, in a quotation from Isaiah, as a place where Christ was "despised and rejected of men." This vexed the soul of the mayor of Liverpool, who protested to the Bishop. Bishop Ryle, in three successive letters, requested Mr. Herring to apologise for his expressions, saying that his language "cannot altogether be defended" ("altogether" is good; either a thing can be defended, or it cannot), that his position is "indefensible," that the Unitarians simply hold "views widely different from our own" about our Lord Jesus Christ, and that "some of their views are defective about the Second Person of the Trinity."

From this we must gather, either that Bishop Ryle does not know what he is writing about, or that he has given up the Apostles' Creed, or else that he is suggesting a very time-serving and dishonourable compromise, because the Unitarian complainant is a prominent and powerful official. And we sadly fear that the last is the case. The Bishop of Liverpool is an old man, but his wits must be as keen as ever, and he does not write without understanding what he says, and he knows perfectly well that his description of the Unitarians and his criticism of Mr. Herring's definition of them, are alike absurd. The "Plymouth Brethren" or the "Peculiar People" may be described as holding views "widely different" from our own

about the relations between the various Persons of the Trinity, but they do not reject the Trinity altogether. To describe the Unitarians in terms which any sect in Christendom might fairly use about any other is, in plain language, to make a false description. And to apologise for their views as being "defective" and to limit that deficiency to the "Second Person of the Trinity" is to be falser still. People may have "defective" views about the different Persons of the Trinity, and yet believe in the Trinity. The Unitarians do not believe in the Trinity at all, they reject the Second Person, they reject the Third, and, to the mind of the Christian who believes in the indivisible Trinity in Unity, they must, in consequence, reject the First also. Whatever be the God the Unitarians believe in, He is not the God of the Christians. The Unitarian, from a Christian point of view, is as much an infidel as a Mussulman or a Buddhist. Bishop Ryle innocently pretends to believe him merely a kind of Nonconformist. Nonconformists will be duly thankful.

On the Unitarian position, thus unskilfully—and we venture to add, dishonestly—disguised by the Bishop, depends the justification of Mr. Herring's language. The Unitarian, with the Gospels in his hand—an advantage denied to other infidels—deliberately refuses to accept Christ as the Son of God and the Saviour of the world. Our Lord's atoning sacrifice, His gift of the Holy Ghost, he ostentatiously contemns and discredits, and makes a propaganda of his infidelity.

And yet Bishop Ryle insists that the Unitarians do not "despise and reject" Christ. Then who in the wide world does?

The Bishop's argument would probably be that the Unitarians honour Christ as a teacher. What matter, if they reject Him as a Saviour? And, whatever he may say about "despise," the Bishop cannot get out of the word "reject." Moreover, in honouring Jesus as a teacher—in whom, however, they do not believe—the Unitarians are but on a level with the Mohammedans, who put Mahomet before Him, and with the Jews, who crucified Him, but nevertheless paid Him respect as a teacher, called Him "Rabbi," and said He taught the truth, though finally they failed to prefer Him to Barabbas. And we know what our Lord, in His turn, thought of the people, of whom He said, "This people honoureth Me with their lips, but their heart is far from Me." Does Bishop Ryle really imagine that the people who pay Christ these sham honours are not comprehended within the scope of the prophet's utterance, "He was despised and rejected of men"? If the prophet was not speaking of the people who crucified Christ, who repudiated Christ, discredited His sacrifice, rejected His atonement, and deliberately denied His claims, whom was he speaking of at all? Of nobody, we suppose, except, perhaps, of vicars who refuse to hearken to the time-serving counsels of bishops.

We confess these quibbles sicken us. From the School Board in London and from the palace at Liverpool comes the same insolent claim on the part of infidels to the name of "Christian." It is the "unsectarian tendency" run mad. It is positively taken for granted that the cardinal tenets of the Christian creed are mere sectarian shibboleths, and that "faith in the Holy Trinity" is of no more importance than trumpery differences concerning clothes and candles; and, lo and behold! this Balaam of a Bishop—we will here refer to Balaam's steed—stands up to criticise, if not exactly curse, the men who oppose such arrogant pretensions and venture to speak the truth.

A "HARDY ANNUAL."

THE Deceased Wife's Sister is again about to come to the front in the House with, let us hope, renewed life and vigour, to utter her pertinent and logical question. "Why should I," she asks, "be deprived of what is conceded to me in every other Christian country but this? I claim the honour and the privilege of a wife, and of the most fitting mother of my sister's children." And why not? If the Deceased Wife's Sister had been a test question at the recent election, instead of disestablishment and robbery of parsons and publicans, it would have been more to the credit of the constituencies. We think that while petitions, in the ordinary sense, on a public question like that of the Suspensory Bill, may be useful *numerically*, a much more effective means of gaining a hearing is open to the advocates of this "hardy annual," which calls for the redress of a moral and social wrong, as well as a religious blunder. Let everyone send the particulars, *names* being in confidence only, and not for publication, to Mr. Paynter Allen, the persevering Secretary of the Marriage Reform Union, 21, Parliament Street, Westminster, of every case they know where the children had to suffer because they could not have the *constant* and regular care of their father's wife, having only the chance and casual superintendence of their aunt. He would then be able to lay before our representatives a summary of similar cases, or even of each separate case. In the same way, let all widowers who wish to marry their sisters-in-law —but *not* in blood, as is so falsely and persistently urged—send their names, number of children (if any), age, and calling, to Mr. Allen. We have pointed out before, and we again reiterate, that nature which repels the idea of marriage with a sister *by blood*, is right when she instinctively points the man to his wife's sister as the best one to replace the lost wife and mother. To say that the desired reform would open the way to family calousies, and prevent the family circle embracin g

the wife's sister as a permanent resident within its limits, is another form of saying that no wife is safe with a companionable friend living in the house with her and her husband. This is a sweeping and outrageous condemnation of the male sex. To many, no doubt, such conditions may, and often do, prove a snare ; but even a weak man may be a good husband, and it is only the "worser sort," who are slaves to their carnal appetites, that should be included in this unwholesome category, not those who really love their wives, in spite of all the designing women in the world. If the *mightily misguiding Old Man* would have thrown all the weight of his influence into this question, he would have helped the nation to its just right, instead of leading it on to perpetrate sacrilege and spoliation. We wish the Bill may pass this session. If it does not, it will cast another reproach upon the present Government and drive another nail into its coffin.

MR. MIVART'S REJOINDER.

Suave mari magno turbantibus æquora ventis,
E terrâ magnum alterius spectare laborem.

READERS of the above two lines have always thought their author Lucretius very unamiable when he expressed so selfish a sentiment. Yet that sentiment is very human, and we cannot deny that we feel a touch of it, as we watch the crew of Peter's fishing-boat toiling and rowing, amidst the tempest which Mr. Mivart's first article on Hell has excited. We cannot indeed flatter ourselves that we have on all points firm ground beneath our own feet ; indeed, it is our sad experience to feel that we are all afloat, moving, we trust, towards a higher end, but yet to an end, which is to ourselves quite unknown. And here we find that that great body, which has boasted itself to be firmly founded on its rock, and has made such game of our variations, and asserted so positively its own absolute unchangeableness, is itself quite as variable, and quite as much afloat, as we ourselves. One of its chief weapons for dominating souls has ever been the fear of Hell, which it has known so well how to exhibit to trembling souls ; but now it appears that that fear is to be laid aside, like the racks and thumbscrews of the Inquisition, in some museum of medieval curiosities. And the living irrefragable authority that it once claimed to exercise over men's minds is to be reduced to the minimum of Papal authority alone, and that authority rendered practically powerless by the admission that it is not determined when, and under what conditions, the Pope's teaching is infallible. None of the changes that we have witnessed in our Protestant churches is so complete as this change of front in the Church of Rome, which appears not unlikely to be effected by the efforts of revolutionists within her pale.

We do not propose to follow Mr. Mivart further in his views on Hell, which are reasserted without any modification in his Rejoinder, nor in his controversy with the Roman Catholic Bishop of Nottingham and Father Clarke, S.J., nor in his discussion of technical theological words and phrases. We think that we can gather, from the mocking contemptuous tone that he adopts towards many of his Church's doctors, that he is at heart as convinced, as any agnostic could be, of the unreality of most theological phrases, and perhaps of the unreality of the whole science or pseudo-science of theology. The point in this article which interests us most, and the one to which we invite the attention of our readers, is his mental position with regard to his Church and its authority.

He is a pronounced disciple of Cardinal Newman, and a remarkable example of the strange fact that while that great apostate has to a large extent sacerdotalised the Church of England, he has to at least an equal extent, by his own influence and that of the crowd of sceptics who followed him within her pale, Protestantised the Church of Rome. The position of Mr. Mivart's mind is decidedly Protestant. He claims the most absolute freedom of private judgment in all matters of science—in astronomy, notwithstanding the Pope's judgment in the case of Galileo, that the earth does not move—in biology, anthropology and geology, irrespective of Genesis—in criticism, including all questions with regard to the origin and authority of the Sacred Books, and (what is the most important point) in ethics. On this point we must quote his words :—

> In ethical science there must be an analogous process (to that in the other sciences) to a greater or less extent, and the more men's intellects are exercised in ethics, the more religion must triumph. And every man is absolutely compelled to ground his belief on his individual ethical intuitions. Let him be ever so disposed to accept authority, he must, if he is conscientious, accept it because he individually judges that it is right for him to accept it and submit himself to it.

Let any of our readers compare Mr. Mivart's mental position with that of Ignatius Loyola, as described in our number of April 22nd, and he will see what perfect contraries the two positions are. Ignatius taught that the mind must be forced in all points of practical conduct as well as theological belief, even against the evidence of its own senses, to think and act with the Church. Mr. Mivart teaches that it must ground its moral belief on its own ethical intuitions. The former is the Catholic position of mind, whereas the latter is sheer Protestantism.

Ethics and theology were supposed to be the domain exclusively reserved for Church authority, in which private judgment must not be permitted to intrude. Mr. Mivart has, as we have seen, asserted absolute individual freedom in the first of these departments. He has not expressly made the same claim with regard to strictly theological belief. Yet he has taken that freedom with regard to the traditional belief respecting Hell which certainly belongs to the department of theology. Nor can he consistently decline to apply the same scientific treatment to all the existing beliefs respecting things divine. He believes theology to have been developed, and to be still in process of development. It is, therefore, a legitimate task for science to trace the stages and the sources of that development. Taking a Christian creed as it exists in his own Church, or in any other Christian community, a Roman Catholic professor may trace the ideas which it embodies to Jesus of Nazareth Himself, to Paul, to Philo, to Plato, to Aristotle, and to other thinkers and seers more distant and more ancient than any of these. He must be as free to investigate the genesis of that belief as an astronomer is to inquire into the genesis of all the worlds.

There is, however, one authority to which our author expresses entire submission, that of the Pope. He even boasts himself a Papist. He says :

Catholics may well exclaim, "Thank God we are *Papists!*" The essentially Papal nature of the Christian Church has been made more and more clearly manifest in the course of the last four centuries. The happiness and comfort which result from the fact that God in His mercy has made the Church essentially Papal has been many times manifested, but hardly more clearly than, unintentionally as well as intentionally, by the Bishop of Nottingham.

Mr. Mivart hopes that the Pope may paternally check the exuberant orthodoxy of that *enfant terrible* of the Roman Church, Bishop Bagshawe. This he will probably do, dexterously avoiding meanwhile pronouncing any opinion on the question at issue about Hell, respecting which, we venture to think, he possesses no more information than Mr. Mivart or ourselves. The present Pope is a judicious and cautious man, who has not, like poor Pio Nono, the ambition of signalising his pontificate by launching new dogmas, but who knows well that one who is infallible must always be specially careful to avoid mistakes. He will leave Mr. Mivart alone in his Protestanto-Papism, which is all that that gentleman desires, and we imagine that it is the caution and reticence which now reigns at the Vatican, that renders the Papal autocracy such a happiness and comfort to our author. He would think differently if another Pius IX. were to succeed Leo XIII.

He must, however, be reminded that the origin and development of the Papal power is another field open to historical science, in which he is bound, as a professor and as a man, to give to the various questions arising the same scientific treatment which he claims for all other departments of knowledge. On what foundation will he base the Papal claim to infallible authority which he esteems so great a blessing? He will hardly venture to rely on texts like the *Tu es Petrus;* for historical criticism has for him thrown a mist of uncertainty round the document in which that text is contained; he can hardly allege ecclesiastical tradition, and the opinions of eminent Catholic divines, for he has disregarded such authority in his dissertation upon Hell; he can hardly say that His Holiness' own assertion of his own authority is sufficient proof. Thus it only remains that his belief is founded on his own personal intuitions, assisted in this case by the happiness and comfort of having a distant and generally dumb authority to appeal to, in opposition to the near and extremely vocal denunciations of Father Clarke and Bishop Bagshawe.

But let us not be so ill-natured as to rejoice in the perplexities of our brethren. It is only the immense protentiousness of the Roman Church which excuses in us a smile, or perhaps a laugh, when we see storms like those which agitate ourselves, sweeping through the serene temples, which that Church would be supposed to inhabit.

THE Dean and Chapter of Bristol have given instructions that working men and their friends shall be shown over the cathedral on the first Saturday afternoon in every month, from May to September.

THERE were two large meetings on Friday, the 28th ult., in the Guildhall on the Welsh Suspensory Bill. The members of the University made excellent speeches of a somewhat academic character in the afternoon; the evening audience were roused to a greater display of enthusiasm; but the meetings were rather designed to diffuse information than to appeal to sentiment, and they served this purpose admirably.

CORRESPONDENCE.

To the Editor of the CHURCH OF ENGLAND PULPIT AND ECCLESIASTICAL REVIEW.

NATIONAL RELIGION.

SIR,—It will be a distinct loss on the side of opposition to the Welsh Suspensory Bill and the Disestablishment and Disendowment of our National Church, if the opponents do not keep more prominently before the British public that they are contending for the recognition of a *National Religion* quite as much as injustice not being done in disestablishing and disendowing a Church which is older than Parliament, and holds its endowments from Christian benefactors, and not from the State. I am quite aware that this view of the matter is gainsaid. Those who deny it can learn the truth from many writers. The recognition of a National Religion being a duty to the Sovereign Ruler by a Christian nation was enforced by Cromwell. Dr. Chalmers delivered a course of lectures on the subject which earned the thanks of distinguished Englishmen. The Dean of Llandaff very recently put forth this view as strongly as he could, by saying that he would rather see a National Religion bearing the title of some who are most opposed to the Church of England than none; and though he should not like certain opinions thus established by the nation, yet he would submit to it with the best grace he could.

To those who feel, on every ground of Scriptural example, the righteousness of religion being nationally recognised, Dr. Vaughan's strongly expressed opinion is very valuable. He has been a consistent Liberal all his life, but he has left Mr. Gladstone as a political leader because the civil and religious liberty which he believes in is being set aside by the proposed Home Rule Bill, and because a grievous injustice to an integral portion of the Established Church is promoted by the Premier, contrary to all the Premier's former utterances as to the civil and religious position of our Church.

I think the strongest position we can take against Home Rule is the injustice, civilly and religiously, done by this Bill, and the strongest argument against the Welsh Suspensory Bill is *the divorce of religion from our national life.* To say that Nonconformists suffer under our Church, as established, is easier said than proved. Episcopalians really suffered under Cromwell. Again, when disendowment is opposed, there is a stronger argument for Churchmen to use than even its injustice—I mean the withdrawing from the great majority of our population in country parishes the spiritual and temporal help which the clergy of our Church have rendered in the past, and increasingly so in our generation. It has been often said that the clergy bring more with them for national help than they take from Church emoluments. The proportion we clergy pay to Imperial and local taxation is far more than the burdens borne by any other class; and I do not think any one who knows approximately the temporal help given by the clergy will deny that their contribution will be missed if such narrow competence as they have now (when taken all round) is taken from them.

Disendowment of the Church, if it is carried out, will be a considerable loss to the National Exchequer;

but that is nothing compared to the deprivation the poorer classes throughout England must suffer from a possibly inferior body of clergy intellectually, certainly poorer in means to help, men reduced to the pitiable condition of not being able to call their soul their own as teachers and pastors, because reduced to the dependence of Independents. We clergy have our many failings as men. Our Church might do more ; but let any honest advocate of Disestablishment and Disendowment point to any one religious community which has done half as much for the religious and national life of our country ; then let him tell you, Sir, *which* religious community he would "establish" in the room of the Church of England, as a bulwark against Roman Catholicism on the one side, and a check against the departure from the faith of their fathers visible amongst Nonconformists. If our clergy depart from the Scriptural teaching of our Book of Common Prayer, it rests with the laity to say whether or not they will have it so.

Sir William Harcourt has said the residuary legatee of the Disestablished Church of England will be the Church of Rome. I hope not. Independents, Baptists, Irish Nationalist Members of Parliament, seem to forget that Noncomformists, including Roman Catholics, have made large investments in money and land. Disendowment of the leading religious body in Great Britain might certainly lead to disendowment of all others. This point seems to be overlooked by speakers and writers favouring the strengthening (?) of one community by depletion of its temporal aids to live and let live.

Mr. Gee does not allude to such all-round justice, but I hope it will not be long before the Church of England will force all other communions to face it, should the Church be disendowed.

A. D. PRINGLE.

Blakeney, April 29th, 1893.

SUGGESTIVE OUTLINES FOR TEACHERS AND LAY-WORKERS, FOR PULPIT, PLATFORM, AND DESK.—No. 7.—Fear God : Read Eccles. xii. 13.—Introduction : We notice from the words of the wise man, from which we have read our text, that his experience is very near the same we may give at the present time. After all the manifold experiences of the world, no matter what they may have been in all their various ramifications, tangible and experimental experience must necessarily lead us to the conclusion that there is nothing in the world calculated to give the soul sufficient rest and solid comfort but the religion, the grace, and peace, and conscious forgiveness of sins by the Lord Jesus Christ. You may go to riches, to fame, to learning, to ease, to pleasure, to honour, position, and society ; but all is not enough to satisfy the longings of the immortality of the soul. This is an established fact that cannot be explained away by the scientist or the philosopher, that something in man which is his superior part and indestructible, and which alone needs the infinite power of the Spirit of God to satisfy and sustain. We notice in our text a conclusive testimony and summary which should definitely settle the mind to fear and serve the Lord. Notice, then — 1. A question settled : Experience leads us to this conclusion, we have wandered and tried all things, but they are a failure. 2. Love and fear God : This, then, is the course to take to enjoy happiness and peace of the soul, seeing that there is nothing in the world to enable us to satisfy the cravings of the soul. 3. Keep true and firm to God's Word : There must be no compromise with the world ; there must be no departure from the Word of God. This, indeed, is our rule of faith, and the foundation of our religious life and character. Our blessed Lord has told us, "If we know those things, happy are we if we do them." We have great need to keep close to the Word of God in these times, when there is so much to undermine our faith, which was once delivered to the saints. 4. Stand steadfast to the end : Yes, unmovable ; you will need the grace of God to fully pursue the Christian course, seeing there are so many temptations and allurements around us, that we need Divine power in our soul to be able to combat with every evil influence around us. Need I say our evil hearts always require to be carefully watched, and ever looking to God that He may in His infinite mercy keep us from departing from the paths of rectitude, religion, and piety. May He keep us from falling—may we always fear and keep His Word !—THOMAS HEATH, Plymouth.

A MEETING of the Subjects Committee of the Church Congress was held at Birmingham on Monday, under the presidency of the Bishop of Worcester. The revised programme was approved and will shortly be published. There will be three meetings for working men, and the subjects for these include "The Work of the Church amongst Artisans," "Licensing Reform," and the "Church's Connection with the State." At the Congress proper, questions of Church reform, "The Relations of the Church of England towards other Branches of the Anglican Communion and towards Religious Bodies not of the Anglican Communion," "Home Missions," "The Financial Position of the Clergy," and a series of labour questions will be debated.

AT the half-yearly meeting of the General Council of the University of Edinburgh, on the 19th ult. (Sir William Muir, Vice-Chancellor and Principal, presiding), Dr. Scott Dalgleish asked whether the names of the women graduates who were capped a week before had been formally added to the register of the University, and, if so, whether they were entitled to vote at the election of Members of Parliament. The Registrar (Mr. W. Gilbert) replied that, in consequence of objections which had been raised, none of those lately capped had been entered on the register. The Vice Chancellor said that the legal questions involved were under consideration. A report by a subcommittee as to the subscription of tests was presented. The sub-committee expressed their cordial approval of the recommendation of the majority of the University Commissioners, that theological tests should he abolished, on the ground that they afforded no real security for orthodoxy. They thought that the theological teaching of the University, while scientific and non-sectarian, must be such as the students of all the Presbyterian Churches could turn to profitable and practical use in their professional training, the subjects most nearly fulfilling, or capable of fulfilling, these conditions, appearing to them to be—(1) Hebrew and Oriental languages ; (2) Church history ; (3) the Greek of the Septuagint and the New Testament ; (4) comparative religion and the philosophy of religion. After some discussion, it was agreed to recommit the report.

THE week has given us a very important and long-expected book, Professor Henry Pelham's "Outlines of Roman History" (Percival), a well-printed crown

octavo of 538 pages, with three maps. Mr. Pelham's reputation needs no word from any correspondent or reviewer. His book will be bought by every student of Roman history, small and great, and, if a hasty inspection shows anything, it will only increase his fame.

THE Right Rev. James Francis Turner, D.D., who, until a few weeks ago was Bishop of Grafton and Armidale, died at Rome on Thursday, the 27th ult. He was educated at the University of Durham, where he graduated in 1851, and was ordained the following year. He held the office of chaplain and censor of Bishop Cosin's Hall 1852-4, was curate of Walton, Somerset, 1857-8, and rector of North Tidworth, Wilts, 1858-69. In the latter year he was consecrated Bishop of Grafton and Armidale.

A VERY interesting discovery has been made at Jesus, Cambridge, by Mr. Fisher, of Harston, an honorary Fellow of the college. He had a recollection of some arches being temporarily exposed, while some repairs were going on in his undergraduate days, and he asked for leave to search for them. As a result, some very beautiful Early English work has been exposed in the east side of the cloister court. It consists of a door, which probably led to the Chapter-house, and a couple of windows. The new discovery presents many points of interest, especially as showing the level at which the flooring was then laid. There is much good Norman work in Jesus, and it is pleasant that this monument of another period has been successfully brought to light.

IN accordance with the announcement made by the Archbishop of Canterbury at the recent Sons of the Clergy Festival, the governors of that corporation have reopened the Clergy Distress Fund, which was started in 1887, the year of Jubilee, for the relief of the beneficed clergy whose incomes, derived from glebe or tithe, had been affected by the agricultural depression. The fund was exhausted in 1891, but the impoverishment of many of the beneficed clergy at the present time renders it necessary to raise a special fund from which the more urgent cases of distress may be immediately relieved. It is not contemplated that the fund should be of a permanent character, the governors expecting that before long an effort will be made by the Church to raise a large fund for the augmentation of the incomes of small benefices.

THE little band of Cambridge scholars who had been working together at Mount Sinai has lost its most experienced member. Professor Bensly was hard at work in transcribing the Gospels, and he was apparently in excellent health all the time. He returned to Cambridge early last week, was taken seriously ill on Friday afternoon, and died on Sunday from gout in the heart. He was a singularly modest and retiring man, but a thorough and accurate scholar, while he showed a singular generosity in affording time and interest to aid the work of others. His loss would have been deeply felt at any time, but there is something specially mournful for those who are left without his aid in completing the edition of the Syriac Gospels, at which he had worked so enthusiastically.

A CORRESPONDENT of the *British Weekly* says that he hears, from a friend in South Russia, that in a short time extraordinary measures are to be taken against the Stundists, in the whole of South-Western Russia. It is not yet precisely known what these measures are, but secret instructions have been sent to the local police to furnish statistics. It is believed that a certain time is to be given to the Stundists to return to the Orthodox Greek Church, after which all who refuse to do so are to be sent in small detachments of men, women, and children into banishment to Eastern Siberia, and to the Caucasus. The Stundists are treated by local officials, with the sanction of the Russian Government, with brutality, and especially towards women, in a manner too horrible for description. The number of the Stundists is believed to be about 200,000 altogether.

THE Pusey House is to undergo great changes in its *personnel*. Mr. Gore, who has been the strength of the institution, is to be appointed vicar of Radley, in the immediate neighbourhood, and to carry off some five or six residents with him. It will be difficult, if not impossible, to replace him. He has been the referee of hesitating Oxford—and in theology Oxford hesitates a good deal—on all religious and moral problems. This delicate duty he has discharged in such a way as to disarm a deal of criticism, and to attract a great deal of sympathy. His liberal views in theology and politics have done much to remove bitterness from our midst; his strong good sense and tact have reduced very greatly the mischief which might have arisen from a divorce of the religious from the intellectual life of the place.—*Westminster Gazette.*

MRS. BENSON held a reception on Thursday evening at Lambeth Palace to meet the members of Convocation.

PREFERMENTS AND APPOINTMENTS.

Allen, Rev. B. W.; Vicar of Foleshill, Coventry.

Atkins, Rev. Edward, Curate of St. Martin's, Leicester, and Second Master of Wyggeston's School; Vicar of St. Nicholas's, Leicester.

Baker, Rev. Arthur, M.A.; Chaplain to the *Aurora*.

Bannister, Rev. Alfred, M.A.; Vicar of Elton, Herefordshire.

Barlee, Rev. William, M.A., Curate-in-Charge; Rector of Intwood with Keswick annexed, Norfolk.

Bayly, Rev. R. Burges, M.A., Curate of St. Michael's, Brighton; Rector of Castle Frome, Herefordshire.

Biddulph, Rev. Godfrey John, M.A., Curate of Sandringham-with-West Newton; Rector of Sywell, Northampton.

Cree, Rev. E. C., B.A., Curate of Ackworth; Rector of Huish-Champflower, Somersetshire.

Ditchett, Rev. Henry Arthur; Rector of Woodland, Barrow-in-Furness.

Dolby, Rev. Reginald, M.A.; Chaplain to the *Galatea*.

Dredge, Rev. Norris, M.A.; Vicar of Orcop, Herefordshire.

Eden, Rev. Charles Page; Vicar of Knighton, Leicester.

Elliott, Rev. T. H., M.A., Vicar of Totnes; Acting Chaplain to the 5th (Haytor) Volunteer Battalion of the Devonshire Regiment.

Faithfull, Rev. Robert Colquhoun, M.A.; Rector of Glinton, Northamptonshire.

Faulkner, Rev. Frederick John, M.A.; Rector of Woolfardisworthy, Devonshire.

Flynn, Rev. Francis; Chaplain to the *Thunderer* (temporarily).

Fowke, Rev. Charles Rowland, B.A.; Vicar of Billesdon, Leicestershire.

Griffiths, Rev. John, M.A.; Vicar of St. Catherine's, Colwyn.

Harrison, Rev. John Butler, M.A., Rector of Paulers Pury; Chaplain to the High Sheriff of Northamptonshire (Mr. E. Grant, Lichborough Hall).

Hartley, Rev. Francis Clement, B.A.; Chaplain in Her Majesty's Fleet.

Horton. Rev. Reginald, M.A., Vicar of Dymock; Surrogate for the Diocese of Gloucester and Bristol.

Hosegood, Rev. John Hill, M.A., Curate; Rector of Thelbridge, Devonshire.

Jeffery, Rev. Edward John, M.A.; Perpetual Curate of Frithelstock, Devonshire.

Jones, Rev. John, B.A.; Rector of Llandeglas, Mold.

Knapton, Rev. H. P., M.A., Vicar of Spreylon, Bow, North Devon; Honorary Diocesan Organising Secretary for the Church Army for the Diocese of Exeter.

Kneale, Rev. Thomas Redfern, M.A., Curate of St. Jude's, Andreas; Vicar of Rushern, Isle of Man.

Lavies, Rev. E. B., Vicar of Donisthorpe; Honorary Diocesan Organising Secretary for the Church Army for the Diocese of Southwell.

Macdonald, Rev. Frederick William, M.A., Vicar of Stapleford and Berwick St. James, Wilts; Rural Dean of Wyly Portion.

MacDouall, Rev. P. G.; Licensed to Officiate in the Diocese of Peterborough.

Meredith, Rev. John, B.A.; Vicar of Luddendenfoot, Yorkshire.

Morgan, Rev. John Percy, B.A.; Chaplain to the Norfolk County School.

Morton, Rev. Thomas, Curate-in-Charge of Stamland; Perpetual Curate of Hoylandswaine, near Penistone.

Mylne, Rev. T. W., Vicar of Addington, Croydon; Vicar of Holy Trinity, Maidstone.

Naters, Rev. C. C., M.A.; Curate-in-Charge of Dunmow, Essex.

Nesbit, Rev. Robert B., Vicar of South Cowton; Vicar of Great Ayton-with-Easby, Yorkshire.

Orpen, Rev. Edward Chatterton, M.A.; Licensed Preacher in the Diocese of Exeter.

Rice, Rev. A. C. H., M.A.; Chaplain to the *Penelope*, for Ascension.

Ricketts, Rev. Henry Charles, M.A.; Rector of Gidleigh, Devonshire.

Rowe, Rev. Alfred William, M.A.; General Preacher in the Diocese of Lincoln.

Stoyle, Rev. W. Blin, Curate of Alford; Vicar of Mumby, Alford, Lincolnshire.

Torr, Rev. Thomas Joseph, M.A.; Rector of Northleigh, Devonshire.

Watson, Rev. William Sparrow, M.A., Head Master of the Dorset County School, Dorchester; Permission to Officiate in the Diocese of Salisbury.

Whatton, Rev. Arundell; Organising Chaplain of the London Diocesan Deaconesses' Institution.

Whitelaw, Rev. M. C., Curate-in-Charge of Alexton, Leicestershire; Rector of Denton and Caldicote, Hunts.

CLERICAL OBITUARY.

Bellamy, Rev. James, Priest, at West Brighton, on the 22nd ult.

Bensly, Rev. Robert Lubbock, M.A., Senior Fellow of Gonville and Caius College, and Lord Almoner's Professor of Arabic, at Cambridge, on the 23rd ult., aged 61.

Cutting, Rev. William Aubrey, Vicar of the parish, at Gayton Vicarage, within a week of his wife's death, on the 24th ult., aged 59.

Gilbert, Rev. George, M.A., Vicar of Claxton, near Norwich, at the Great Eastern Hotel, on the 23rd ult., aged 66.

Meade, Rev. William, M.A., Rector of Binegar, at 16, the Circus, Bath, on the 22nd ult., aged 72,

Turner, Rev. James Francis, D.D., Bishop of Grafton and Armidale, at Rome, on the 27th ult., aged 65.

FIRST REMOVE THE CAUSE.

MEN frequently worry and trouble themselves a great deal in trying to cure the symptoms of vital weakness' nervous exhaustion, and kindred ailments, instead of endeavouring to first remove the cause. This can be done by Mr. Harness' Electropathic Treatment without the aid of drugs. It is useless to tell sufferers to employ their minds and bodies in useful work and to forget their disorders, so long as the cause of their troubles is not removed. How can it be expected that when they are fatigued by the least exertion they can occupy themselves by studying, walking, or other exercise? Even in conversation they frequently lose the thread of it and repeatedly find their memory failing them. What can they do? Physic will not cure them—perhaps the leading physicians have failed to afford them any relief, and they have consequently become hopeless. It is to such as these that Mr. Harness' new combined Electropathic Belt and Suspensory is so strongly recommended, as, by its gentle but continuous action, invigorating electric currents are imperceptibly generated and conveyed direct from the spinal cord to the affected parts. It is this scientifically constructed and convenient appliance which silently but surely acts upon the vital organs, and removes the cause of the patient's disease, effecting a wonderful change in his health, character, and conduct, and speedily enabling him to return to his natural tastes and habits, and enjoy once more the full vigour of youth, with all its accompanying pleasures.

We may add that this perfect Electro-medical appliance is exceedingly comfortable to wear, gives wonderful support and vitality to all the internal organs of the body, prevents chills, imparts new life and vigour to the debilitated constitution, stimulates the organic action, promotes the circulation, assists digestion, and promptly renews that vital energy, the loss of which is the first symptom of decay. Its healing properties are multifarious. It stimulates the functions of various organs, increases their secretions, gives tone to muscle and nerves, relaxes morbid contractions, improves nutrition, and effectually renews exhausted nerve force. Acting directly on the system, it sustains and assists its various functions, and thus promotes the health and vigour of the entire frame. Besides these benefits, the mind is maintained in a buoyant, cheerful state, and every faculty is stimulated to the highest condition of intellectual strength.

Gentlemen who read the above announcement have only to visit London and call at the Electropathic and Zander Institute (52, Oxford Street, W.) to be convinced of the marvellous curative powers of Electricity and Mr. Harness' perfect methods of imperceptibly applying the current. The medical officers of the establishment are in daily attendance, and may be consulted free of charge either personally or by letter.

The Church of England Pulpit.

SALVATION FROM DEATH.

By the Rev. W. T. HOBSON, Vicar of St. Barnabas, Douglas.

Sermon Preached in St. Barnabas' Church, on Sunday, March 19th, 1893.

"Verily, verily, I say unto you, If a man keep My saying, he shall never see death."—John viii. 51.

WE do not wonder that this word of Jesus roused afresh, as it did, the indignation of His enemies with whom He was in sharp and decisive controversy. Just before He had uttered an equally startling saying about His own words spoken to them: "He that is of God, heareth God's words; ye therefore hear them not, because ye are not of God." And the Jews answered and said unto Him, "Say we not well that thou art a Samaritan and hast a devil? Jesus answered, I have not a devil; but I honour my Father, and ye do dishonour me." And now He makes the announcement of our text, which, but that they had heard the like from Him frequently before, must have astounded as well as angered them. "Verily, verily, I say unto you, If a man keep my saying, he shall never see death." "Then said the Jews unto Him, Now we know that thou hast a devil;" and they proceed in a way which we shall notice presently to controvert His saying.

But there is one point of view in which we do well to look at all such sayings of our Lord as these two which so specially offended the unbelieving Jews, and called forth from them the angry and abusive charge—"Thou hast a devil." I mean their amazing self-assertion as coming from the carpenter of Nazareth, from this poor and lowly, and, till a few months before, unknown and unheard of Galilean peasant. Just think of one, to all outward seeming a mere man in humble life, declaring about His own utterances, in the face of the whole teaching body of His nation who were utterly opposed to Him and His pretensions, "He that is of God, heareth God's words; ye therefore hear them not, because ye are not of God." "Verily, verily, I say unto you, If a man keep my saying, he shall never taste of death;" or, as on this same occasion, and recorded earlier in the same chapter, "I am the light of the world; he that followeth me shall not walk in darkness, but shall have the light of life." And think of Him who uttered these words as professing to be, and seeming to be, pre-eminently "meek and lowly in heart"—held to be a pattern not of pride but of humility, not of self-assertion but of self-denial. Oh, my brethren, I want you to see that if Jesus was not indeed all He declared Himself to be, and all we believe Him to be, if He was not the Son of God Incarnate, God manifested in the flesh, then His supposed humility and meekness are all a mistake or a pretence. Instead of being meek and lowly in heart, He was the most arrogant and boastful of impostors. Even if His miracles proved Him to be a prophet, the pride and the self-assertion of His words would go far to prove him to be the devil's prophet, not God's. No prophet of Jehovah had ever used such language. Neither Moses nor Samuel, not Elijah nor Isaiah, had ever glorified themselves like this. There are some in the present day who reject all the distinctive teaching of Christ or His Apostles about Himself and His work that He came on earth to do, but profess great admiration for His character, as well as for some parts of His teaching. They betray the Son of Man with a kiss. But after all, the Jews who rejected Him were much more logical and consistent in their unbelief. They saw what was surely plain enough from His words, that if not the Son of God as no other man was, if He had not as He said "proceeded forth and come from God," then His character as a holy man, above all as a meek and lowly man, could not be sustained. If He was not the Holy One of God, they were right in saying He had a devil. Not accepting Him as the Christ, the Son of God, they were only consistent, aye, they were right, in hating and abhorring Him as an impostor. Nay, in that case He was plainly guilty of death, and they did well to condemn Him to death.

On the other hand, the true faith about Christ is that which alone harmonizes His own sayings about Himself with the character which the Gospel histories give Him, and which is now universally accepted of Him even by unbelievers. Especially it alone harmonises His wondrous self-assertion, with His wondrous humility and meekness. For His self-assertion remains and is undeniable, whatever we believe about His person. It is undeniable that He put Himself forward as claiming the faith and trust, the love and obedience of mankind; that He proclaimed Himself "the light of the world" and "the life of men"; that He made acceptance or rejection of Him, loving Him or not loving Him, the test of a godly or a godless character, of a truth-loving or a truth-hating man. Nothing can exceed His boundless self-assertion—aye, and nothing can excuse it, not to say reconcile it with His professed lowliness and meekness, except the truth that He who was in the form of God, God and with God from all eternity, was made flesh and dwelt among us; that He emptied Himself of His Godhead glory, and took on Him the form of a servant, and being found in fashion as a man He humbled

Himself, and became obedient to the Father unto death, even the death of the cross.

Now in our text this our Incarnate God, speaks as, what He is elsewhere called, "the life of men," as "that eternal life which was with the Father and was manifested unto us." As "the light of the world" He had said shortly before, on this same occasion, "He that followeth Me, shall not walk in darkness, but shall have the light of life." Aye, "the light of life." We cannot separate these two, "light" and "life." Those who have Christ's life have His light; those who have His light, have His life. So in the early Church the regenerate were called the illuminated in testimony to the truth that those who are enlivened are also enlightened, that those who "are passed out of death into life" are also in one and the same event called and brought "out of darkness into His marvellous light." But now as "the life of the world," "the life of men," He says in like manner, "Verily, verily I say unto you, If a man keep My saying he shall never taste of death."

Let us consider this word of our Lord as containing a condition and a promise, and first as stating the condition of the promise, and secondly the promise attached to the condition.

The condition is, "If a man keep My saying." It may be well to remark that the word rendered "saying" is the same as is so commonly rendered "word" elsewhere. Indeed it is the very same as that by which the Son of God is called the "Word," the "Word of God." I mention this because the word "saying" seems rather to mean some particular saying of our Lord's, and I think we understand by "word" rather the general sum of His teaching. It is of course rendered "word" instead of "saying" in the revised version. "If a man keep My word" means "If a man embrace and hold fast My teaching, My doctrine, become and continue My disciple." He had said before, also with a "Verily, verily, I say unto you," "He that heareth My word, and believeth on Him that sent Me, hath everlasting life, and shall not come into condemnation, but is passed out of death into life." And here the condition is much the same, and, indeed, the promise is much the same also. But it is not only "He that heareth My word;" it is "he that *keepeth* My word." "If a man *keep* My word." Some listened to Jesus and heard His word and followed Him as His disciples; but soon they were offended at His teaching, or alarmed at the persecution setting in against it, and so they turned back and walked no more with Him. The promise of our text is not for such as they. Such are not true disciples. "If ye *continue* in My word, then are ye My disciples indeed." The promise is not to the rocky ground, but to the good ground, hearers—to those "who having heard the word *keep* it," aye even though afflictions and persecutions arise because of the word—"*keep* it, and bring forth fruit with patience." My brethren our Lord does not hide from us the difficulties of keeping His word, the temptations to cast it away, and to cease being His disciples even in name. He tells us plainly of those who only "for a while believe, and in time of temptation fall away." And His promises, all His exceeding great and precious promises, are to those who in spite of all these difficulties and temptations, keep His word, and continue following Him. "He that endureth unto the end shall be saved." "He that overcometh and keepeth My works unto the end, to him will I give power over the nations." "Be thou faithful unto death, and I will give thee the crown of life." Remember that when you hear and read of this or that promise being made to Christ's disciples, it means His "disciples indeed;" or being made to those who "hear His word," it means to those who, "having heard His word, *keep* it." Remember that continuance in Christ's word, keeping it, is the test of true discipleship, and that there is no promise held out to anything but true discipleship. See that you are Christ's "disciples *indeed*." See that you are those who will *keep* at any cost, as well as hear, His word.

Well, now, what is the promise of our text made sure to such with our Lord's "Verily, verily, I say unto you" It is this, "He shall never see death." To "see death," "and to "taste of death," were Hebraisms for the simpler expression "to die." The Jews did not dishonestly misquote our Lord, but merely put one Hebraism for another of exactly the same meaning, when, as we read in the next verse, they represented Him as saying, "If a man keep My saying, he shall never taste of death." Both expressions mean simply "he shall never die." So you will remember Jesus said to Martha, as He was about to raise her brother Lazarus from the dead, "He that liveth and believeth on me *shall never die*." So He said in the Synagogue at Capernaum about Himself as the Bread of Life, "This is the bread which came down from heaven, that a man may eat thereof and *not die*." Now what is the meaning of this promise so often repeated in such slightly varying forms? Of course we all understand it to mean salvation, final and everlasting salvation. But how can we account for its taking this form. He shall not see or taste of death, shall not die, shall never die. My brethren, "the wages of sin is death." It is death that has passed upon us all because we all have sinned. The curse that broods over our sinful race is the doom of death; and all the pain and suffering that are in us and around us, are just the seeds of death working in us and around us. Salvation from this state of things must be something that is the reverse of death. It must be "not to taste of death," "not to die," "to live for ever" instead. And so "this is the promise which He hath promised us, even eternal life." To live for ever and not to die is to be delivered from the penalty of sin. I think the only real question which the pro-

mise of our text suggests is this: How can it be reconciled with the fact that those who believe on Jesus, those who keep His word, do die? His Apostles died, Peter and John as well as Judas. The Jews were perfectly right when they said in reply to our Lord's words in our text, "Abraham is dead and the prophets." Their mistake was in making that an answer to His words, in not seeing that He referred to that which is death indeed, even final and everlasting death. Was Abraham indeed dead? We know he died and was buried. But even the Jews themselves, all except the Sadducees, believed that Abraham was alive in Paradise. Death killed his body, but was not able to kill his soul As long as his soul survived, in the fullest, deepest sense of the word, he had not seen death; and if there is, as we know there is, a resurrection to eternal life in store for him, then he shall indeed live for ever, in body as well as soul, and shall not die. But if a man is destroyed both soul and body, then he is dead indeed. He has seen death in all its terror and awfulness. He has received in full the promised wages of his sin, which is death. My brethren, such a death as that, which is "the second death," is death indeed, is the full plain penalty and wages of sin. And it is exactly such a death as that that the Lord Jesus has warned men of. "Fear not them which kill the body, but are not able to kill the soul, but rather fear Him who is able to destroy both soul and body in hell." So He warns His disciples to keep His word, to keep it even unto any death of martyrdom that persecuting men may inflict. *That*, He tells them, is not real death. It is only the death of the body, it does not touch the soul. There is a death, He warns them, that men cannot inflict, but that God can, in which soul as well as body will be destroyed. That is death indeed. It is that death indeed that they who keep His word shall never see, shall never taste. They shall live for ever instead in what St. Paul (1 Tim. vi. 19, R.V.) calls "a life which is life indeed," in resurrection fulness of life, in endless glory, in the fulness of joy and the pleasures for evermore that are in store for us at God's right hand, in glory, honour, and immortality. To live for ever as we are here, not to see death as the end of this mortal life of sorrow and and suffering, would be but a poor boon to have promised us. It would be to many a one. but, as it were, the commutation of capital punishment into penal servitude for ever. But to pass completely out of death into life, out of the shadow of death that lies even on the brightest spots of the life that now is into the eternal sunshine of the true light of life; to rise to the life immortal, leaving behind for ever all sorrow and sighing, all suffering and all dying, because all sinning: to live for ever a life full of blessedness, full of glad and blessed and glorious service; to live for ever in the likeness of the risen and glorified Christ, the perfected man, the pattern man. And, oh! to be not only like Him, but with Him for ever. This is what He has promised us. This is what is wrapped up for us in the gift of eternal life. All this lies scarcely hidden behind those words of promise to him that keeps Christ's word, that "he shall never see death," "shall never die."

At one time of His earthly ministry we read that many of His disciples went back and walked no more with Him. "Then said Jesus unto the twelve, 'Will ye also go away?' Then Simon Peter answered Him, Lord, to whom shall we go? Thou hast the words of eternal life, and we believe and are sure that Thou art that Christ the Son of the living God." Will *we* not say the same? Has any one else the words of eternal life to speak unto us? Shall we listen to the devil's lie instead, who said long ago, and who is saying still to the death-doomed, "Ye may sin, but ye shall not surely die."

My brethren, sin is a terrible, undeniable, reality. We have all sinned; we were all born in sin and have lived more or less in sin since we were born. And death is a terrible, undeniable reality. that follows hard on sin, and that will overtake in all its bitterness the unsaved sinner. But "God so loved the world (of sinners) that He gave His only begotten Son, that whosoever believeth on Him should not perish, but have everlasting life." Salvation from sin and death is also a great reality, a glorious reality. Everlasting life is a blessed reality. It is offered to mankind in the Gospel of Christ; it is given to men who accept Christ, who believe on Him, and love Him, and serve Him. "God gave unto us eternal life, and this life is in His Son. He that hath the Son, hath the life; he that hath not the Son of God, hath not the life." "He that heareth my word," saith the Son of God, "and believeth on Him that sent me, hath everlasting life, and shall not come into condemnation, but is passed out of death into life."

A MOVEMENT has been set on foot to provide a vicarage-house for the parish of Hubberholme, Skipton, and an old house near the church, formerly the property of Bishop Heber, is to be restored. A memorial stone in the front elevation will bear the inscription:—"A D. 1893. Restored in loving memory of Bishop Heber." The house will be built by public subscription, and including the purchase of the site, the cost will be about £600. The architect is Mr. J. W Broughton, of Skipton.

MR. HENRY PEARSON GATES, Chapter Clerk of Peterborough Cathedral, Registrar of the archdeaconries of Northampton and Oakham, died at his residence, the Vineyard, Peterborough, on the 6th inst., aged seventy-four. Mr. Gates was secretary to Bishops Davys Jeune, and Magee, and was four times elected mayor of the city. He was also honorary secretary of the Peterborough Cathedral Restoration Fund, to which he contributed most liberally In 1883 he served as High Sheriff of Cambridgeshire and Hunts.

SECRET PRAYER.

By the Rev. JAMES SILVESTER, M.A., Curate-in-Charge of Cublington, Bucks.

Sermon Preached at Aston Abbotts Church, on Wednesday Evening, February 22nd, 1893.

"But thou, when thou prayest, enter into thy closet, and when thou hast shut the door, pray to thy Father which is in secret; and thy Father which seeth in secret shall reward thee openly."—Matt. vi. 6.

THE time of the annual commemoration of our Lord's sojourn in the wilderness, is a solemn, and ought to be a profitable one. But it can only be profitable as it is spiritual. Mere abstinence from food is not the fasting of God's appointment and acceptance; the mere suspension of selfish and worldly pleasure, while the love of the world remains the same, is no true Lenten discipline. That is the real fast which humbles the soul and which issues in righteousness. That is the acceptable observance of Lent which uses its abridgment of lawful enjoyments and employments for the purpose of self-examination and a closer communion with God. So if, led of the Spirit, we go into the wilderness of self-denial, we shall find our Saviour there. In the fellowship of faith with Him we shall learn how to meet and overcome temptation. As His word dwells in us richly we shall become strong in the divine life and fruitful in the divine service. And in the sympathy of the Saviour's love "the solitary place shall be glad for us, and the desert shall blossom as a rose."

Our Lord was a hater of religious shams, and His Sermon on the Mount contains an exposure of them. Both in almsgiving and fasting and prayer, the Pharisees were sanctimonious actors of religion rather than men of real piety. Their religion was a show and a sham, and our Lord has for all time stigmatised such religious acting in the word He Himself has given us—"hypocrisy."* "When thou prayest," says Christ to each of His true followers, "thou shalt not be as the hypocrites are, for they love to pray standing in the synagogues and in the corners of the streets that they may be seen of men; verily, I say unto you, they have their reward." Yes, such an empty parade of prayer has its present reward in the admiration of the ignorant multitude, and in the supreme self-satisfaction of such pretenders to piety. But the ideal which the Lord Jesus set before His people is that of His own beautiful example. "Thou, when thou prayest, enter into thy secret chamber, and when thou hast shut thy door, pray to thy Father which is in secret, and thy Father which seeth in secret Himself shall reward thee openly."

"When thou prayest." The Lord assumes that all His people are given to prayer. The spirit of prayer is the mark of the Christian. Prayer is but the expression of faith, and without faith it is impossible to please God. "Continue in prayer," and "Pray without ceasing" are precepts which can only be carried out by him who ever lives as in the presence of God, who ever labours as in the strength which God giveth. But as prayer is, so to speak, the breath of the spiritual life, so is it the language of that life; and our Lord here is giving counsel for the special acts of prayer in the offices of secret devotion. Those that have no set time for worship know nothing of the prayerful life. On the other hand, our Lord's words here imply that it is by repeated and continual acts of private devotion that the spiritual life is maintained, and that the Christian is prepared for the reward of the Father.

Observe how our Lord characterises acceptable prayer.

I. It is *secret* prayer: "Thou, when thou prayest, enter into thy secret chamber." Even public worship is not to be the ostentatious devotion of hypocrites, and private worship can the more easily attain this end by being offered in solitude and secrecy. It is said that our Lord was the first to enjoin distinctly secret and silent prayer. Mohammedan and heathen devotees still observe the rule of publicly praying aloud, and Hannah's secret prayer in the Temple appears to have been an exception to the custom of the ancient Israelites.* But the Christian religion does not need to blow the trumpet in this way. It cometh not with outward show but with inward grace. It draws its strength not from the favour of men but from the power of God. Hence our Lord bids His followers cultivate secret communion with the Father: "Enter into thy secret chamber." This word (ταμιεῖον) is used in another place by our Lord, in the sense of store-house (Luke xii 24), and this is its common classical meaning. The term, therefore, though it is applied to a room for prayer, may include rooms devoted to other purposes, and indeed to any secret place. What our Lord tells his people is that they must find time to be alone with God. What the worldling fears most the true Christian loves most, even to stand alone in the presence of the great Father. Listen to such a one's testimony in the voice of hymnal song, and cultivate the same heavenly spirit:

My God, is any hour so sweet,
From blush of morn till evening star,
As that which calls me to Thy feet,
The hour of prayer?

For then a day-star shines on me,
Brighter than morn's ethereal glow,
And richer dews descend from Thee,
Than earth can know.

* See a notable paper entitled "Hypocrisis" in the Church of England Pulpit, February 11th, 1893.

* See Cambridge Greek Testament for Schools *in loco.*

What tongue can tell what blest relief,
There for my fainting soul I find,
What strength for warfare, balm for grief,
What peace of mind.

Then is my strength by Thee renewed,
Then are my sins by Thee forgiven;
Then dost Thou cheer my solitude
With hopes of heaven.

Lord, till I reach yon heavenly shore,
No privilege so dear shall be,
As thus my inmost soul to pour
In prayer to Thee.

II. Our Lord points out also the *deliberateness* of secret personal prayer. "Thou, when thou prayest, enter into thy secret chamber, and when thou hast shut the door pray to thy Father." The Lord seems to echo the word of Jehovah to His people in the time of tribulation of old: "Come, my people, enter thou into thy chambers and shut thy doors about thee: hide thyself as it were for a little moment, until the indignation be overpast" (Is. xxvi. 20). "Shut the door." Such a circumstantial injunction in the midst of this high spiritual precept must have a definite meaning. "The world is too much with us," and it requires an earnest effort to keep it in proper subordination to the spiritual life. And thus our Lord seems to say, "Do not be in a hurry, do not be preoccupied. Leave the world outside, and let prayer-time be a time of prayer." How much of power and blessing and joy in prayer is lost through not shutting the door! The mind is distracted, the attention is divided, the eye is not single. The vessels of spiritual desire are not brought empty, and therefore they cannot be filled. Oh, shut the door, when you go to pray to God in secret, upon everything that would hinder the free communication of divine grace to your souls. Like Moses, put off the shoes of worldly occupation from off thy feet as thou goest into the secret of God's presence, as thou standest on the holy ground where Jehovah's glory is seen. Keep silence awhile in the spirit of self-collectedness, or repeat some text of Scripture to promote the sense of His presence of whom thou seekest a blessing.

III. Observe again, that our Lord enjoins upon His people the spirit of *childlike confidence* in secret prayer. "Thou, when thou prayest, pray to thy Father." The Fatherhood of God is the revelation of Christ. The Gentiles knew nothing of this glorious truth, with all their gods many and lords many. Even in the Old Testament Scriptures given to Israel, the doctrine is not prominently taught. It was left for the Son of God to reveal the Father and to bestow on us the adoption of sons. And the work of the Spirit of the Son in the hearts of His people, is to teach them to cry, Abba, Father! "Pray to thy Father." There is no true happiness in prayer until this fact is realised. There is no spiritual power in prayer until this truth is appropriated. On the one hand the Fatherhood of God is the assurance of His love; and, on the other, it is the security for the obedience of our faith. "Pray then to thy Father." Put thyself in the care of His gracious hand. Open thy heart to His pardoning mercy. Enter into His presence, for the Father will receive thee, the Son will intercede for thee, the Holy Spirit will inspire thee to pray. Come boldly unto the throne of grace in full assurance of faith, for whatsoever thou shalt ask of the Father in the Son's name, He will give it thee.

No earthly father loves as He,
No mother, e'er so mild,
Bears and forbears as He has done
With thee, His sinful child.

"Pray," I say, "to thy Father." For this truth written upon thy heart by the Holy Ghost, will prompt thee to obedience. The best of fathers should have the best of sons, and they who know in their hearts God is their Father, will show in their lives that they are His children. "For as many as are led by the Spirit of God, they are the sons of God." "As obedient children, not fashioning yourselves according to your former lusts in your ignorance, but as He which hath called you is holy, so be ye holy in all manner of conversation." Here is the lesson of obedience from the Fatherhood of God, embodied in prayer:—

Art Thou My Father? Let me be
A meek, obedient child to Thee;
And try, in word and deed and thought,
To serve and please Thee as I ought.

IV. Our Lord also enjoins upon His people the duty of *spirituality* in prayer. "Pray to thy Father which is in secret." You will soon tire of secret prayer if it be not spiritual. In the temple of silence and solitude to which the Lord calls His people, their strength must be in God if they would prove the power of prayer. The secret place may be only a store-room or a garret, with no sight or sound to suggest the presence of God.* There will be no concord of sweet sounds but that which faith can hear, no show of glory but that which faith can see. But faith can grasp the Father's hand, faith can hear the Father's voice, faith can enter into the glorious scene within the veil, and "bring all heaven before our eyes." The towering palm, as it lifts its verdant head on high and extends its grateful shade, seems a strange spectacle in the midst of the barren desert. But deep down out of sight there is a spring whose waters fail not, the source and sustenance of its life. Even so the Christian lives and brings forth fruit in the wilderness of this world, but the source of his life lies out of sight. He prays to his Father in secret, he sees by faith Him who is invisible, and from that secret, sacred communion he derives that counsel of grace which guides him here on earth and conducts him at length to the home of God above.

* See remarks on the word *ταμιεῖον* in "Hypocrisis."

V. Lastly, secret personal prayer meets with its *reward from the Father*. "Thy Father which seeth in secret Himself shall reward thee openly." The Christian comes to God believing not only that He lives and loves, but that He is the Rewarder of them that diligently seek Him. Nor is he disappointed of his desire. In his very habit of prayer he finds a blessing, and, like Daniel, he would rather not live than not pray. Through prayer he comes to higher thoughts of God and lower thoughts of himself. Through prayer, according to the precept of the Saviour, he enters not into temptation, but resists and overcomes sin. Through prayer his character is disciplined, his life is fruitful in holiness, his will is brought into union with God's will, his work redounds to the glory of God. Thus

> Prayer makes the darkened cloud withdraw,
> Prayer climbs the ladder Jacob saw,
> Gives exercise to faith and love,
> Brings every blessing from above.

But the promise of our text goes beyond the present blessings of prayer and the present reward of the Father. If in anything a man honours God it is when he prays to Him, and thereby acknowledges that "of Him, and through Him, and to Him are all things." And presently in the upper sanctuary every true lover of prayer, every obedient child of the Father, shall be acknowledged of Him and called to the glory of His Son. If He seeketh spiritual worshippers on earth, how shall He delight in them in heaven; and if in this world prayer has so great a reward for them that give their hearts to it, what shall be its reward of the Father in the life to come?

Be much then in secret prayer at this season. Take the Saviour at His word and prove the truth of His promise, and the Father will give Himself to you as you give yourselves unto prayer. For

> There is a power that man can wield,
> When mortal aid is vain,
> God's love, God's eye, God's arm to reach,
> His listening ear to gain;
>
> That power is prayer, which soars on high,
> Through Jesus, to the throne,
> And moves the Hand that moves the world,
> To bring salvation down.

AT Cambridge, the Lightfoot Scholarship for ecclesiastical history has been awarded to W. E. Jordan, B.A., King's. The examiners give notice that the selected subjects for next year are St. Cyprian and Arminianism in England, 1609-40.

AN east window, designed by Mr. H. Walter Lonsdale, was dedicated on Sunday last, at Rainford parish church. It was placed in the church by Mr. J. Robinson, a parishioner, in memory of his father. The prayers of dedication used by the vicar, the Rev. J. Bridger, were those sanctioned by the Archbishop of the province. The general scheme of the window is suggested by the dedication of the church in honour of God and All Saints.

NOTICES.

All communications respecting the Literary portion of the paper should be addressed to the Editor.

Business communications of every kind should be addressed to Mr. S. GIBBON, at the CHURCH OF ENGLAND PULPIT Office, 160, Fleet Street, London, E.C., to whom cheques and Post-office orders for subscriptions (in advance), three months, 2s., six months, 3s. 6d., twelve months, 6s. 6d., are to be made payable.

The Cases for binding Vol. XXXIV. are now ready.

FOR HEALTH AND IMMORTALITY.

The Ecclesiastical Review.

SATURDAY, MAY 13, 1893.

DISSENT AS A SPIRITUAL FORCE.

THE Welsh Suspensory Bill has opened the question of the relations between the Church and Dissent all over England. Frankly, we wish the matter were pushed by the Church with more activity. There are occasions when the best defence is to attack, and this is one of them. The case against the Church in Wales is, broadly, that against her everywhere else, that she is not a national Church, and does not represent the opinions or supply the needs of the people. Churchmen are generally contented to prove the contrary, they ought to go on and establish the same case against their opponents.

How far do Dissenters represent the religious convictions of the nation? How far do they go towards supplying spiritual needs? is the question for Churchmen to push. We ought to pull the Dissenter off the judgment-seat, and put him in his turn in the dock. Why does not some Church Defence Society set to work to collect the necessary evidence? The Dissenters are unwilling to publish figures, just as some institutions are unwilling to publish accounts. But, in both cases, the figures are generally to be got at. A very little organisation would produce from all the towns in England the number of Dissenting chapels, the average attendance, the sums raised and spent, and especially the amount of debt, the nature and extent of mission and district work done, and the like. The result of such an inquiry would be astonishing, and would open the eyes of many Church people who are still under the impression that the various Dissenting bodies represent a very real and vital spiritual force working in the nation.

It will be found that the actual value of Dissent as a spiritual force is not nearly so great as it is believed to be.

Take the case of Wales. There, if anywhere, Dissent ought to be part of the very life of the people. Figures, however, prove that of the electorate alone, those who have, even only indirectly, expressed themselves in favour of Disestablishment are as three to two, while a vast number have not voted either way. This does not say much for the influence of Dissent, which, in fact, is steadily on the decline.

For instance, between 1884 and 1886 the number of admissions into the Calvinistic Methodists in Wales dropped actually from 10,655 to 6,401, so that in 1877 an inquiry into the reasons of the decline had to be held. In the same period Baptist admissions sank from 4,961 to 4,529. The Congregationalists claim no increase, but year after year return exactly the same figures for members, hearers, Sunday-school teachers and scholars, an impossible state of things, which proves that the real figures are concealed. Why?

Compare these figures with the full, frank, and encouraging statistics given by the Established Church, and there can no longer be any question as to the decline of the influence of Dissent in Wales.

The same might easily be shown to be the case in England. The increase in population and in religious activity has not resulted in any marked increase of members and influence among the Dissenters. They have not even held their own, for the disappearance of some communities, *e.g.*, the Quakers, has not swelled the numbers of the rest. Among different sects the tide of prosperity ebbs and flows, but the sum total of Dissenters does not tend to increase.

Moreover, the mere numbers are no guide to the actual strength of Dissent. Many of the attendants at the chapels are casuals, who would strongly object to being enrolled as members of the sect, whose ministrations they favour from time to time. In fact the "visitor" is now most assiduously catered for by the chapels, which can no longer rely upon a substantial list of regular supporters. They advertise themselves as places of public worship, not to say entertainment, and offer all the attractions they can to strangers in the details of their services, consequently they have largely ceased to teach any particular doctrines. Whatever be the name of the sect, the same sort of hymns, prayers and sermons, will be heard; there is little apparent difference between Baptist, Presbyterian, Wesleyan, Congregationalist. In fact they interchange pulpits and even pastorates. What, for instance, is the position of those followers of Mr. Spurgeon, the Baptist, who now sit under Dr. Pierson, the "sprinkler"? For the sake of a new preacher they have abandoned their sole claim to sectarian existence. Can it have been of much importance? In fact here is the essential weakness of modern dissent, it lost its *raison d'être* when it ceased to dwell on dogmatic differences, and it is now seeking to find in politics what it has lost in theology.

The result of this falling-off in numbers and influence is that each sect of Dissenters concentrates its efforts on self-preservation. Hence the Dissenters do little or no external work. Their clergy never visit, and their congregations take no share in missionary and charitable labours. The machinery whereby the clergy of the Established Church minister to their flock outside church or school is totally wanting in Dissenting communities. All their efforts are confined to paying off chapel debts, ministers' salaries, and the expenses of social entertainments. Very few useful institutions of any kind owe their existence or support to Dissenters. Whenever their contributions travel outside the immediate entourage of the chapel, it is no farther than to the training college. There are honourable exceptions to this rule, but only a few of them, *e.g.*, Mr. Spurgeon's Orphanage.

This selfish limitation probably has its effect upon the enthusiasm which Dissent is capable of inspiring, especially as it is coupled with reckless extravagance. The rapidity with which new chapels are built is equalled only by the rapidity with which they are abandoned. For instance, in Wales, continuously with a decrease in numbers, there has been an increase in chapels, at the rate of one new one for every ten new members! And this can be matched all over England, and outside it. For example, in one town in the Channel Islands, there are two Wesleyan chapels, two Congregationalist, and one Presbyterian. These are alternately full or empty, according to the popularity of the preacher; but they are never all full at the same time, and it is needless to say that not one of them can claim anything like its full complement of members. They are all burdened with debt, in fact two are threatened with extinction; and yet in the same district, and within a stone's throw of all the others, a new chapel is about to be erected with borrowed money. These new chapels are pointed at as evidence of prosperity; they are really the reverse. As a rule, they are raised by the efforts of one particular preacher, who has his day, and leaves a white elephant to his successors. The "sustentation fund" is one of the burdens which is crushing out the energy of Dissenters.

To sum up, it is not too much to say that the majority of Dissenting communities are much in the condition of the islanders who eked out a precarious existence by taking in one another's washing. The chief work they do is to provide for themselves, more or less successfully, and their principal claim to favour lies in supplying a variety in the forms of public worship, which is an agreeable diversion to the increasing number of people who never attend the same church twice running.

But they have ceased to possess, and almost to claim, any distinct form of doctrinal teaching, or to assert and insist upon any special dogma. It is absurd to any longer describe them as the champions of religious freedom, or the inheritors of the principles of the Reformation. Dissenting places of worship have sunk, for the most part, to the position of speculative proprietary chapels, conducted chiefly for the benefit of the ministers, the contractors, and the benevolent persons who supplied, for a consideration, the building funds. We trust, by the way, that this phase of chapel-building will not be lost ken of in any legislation for providing sites for places of worship. Under these circumstances, it is the duty of all Churchmen to expose the hollowness of the claims of the present generation of Dissenters to any large share of spiritual influence, and to meet this incessant girding at the Church with an attack more formidable, because more justified. No doubt Dissent played a useful part in the past, but to describe it as a potent spiritual force at present is simply an abuse of language, and it is high time that this should be pointed out.

CORRESPONDENCE.

To the Editor of the CHURCH OF ENGLAND PULPIT AND ECCLESIASTICAL REVIEW.

MARRIAGE.

SIR,—I venture to think that Mr. Hobson has taken up the cudgels somewhat contrarily. If, as he suggests, the subject be distasteful, why then elaborate as fully as he has done? Like you, Sir, I know nothing of the Marquis of Queensberry's antecedents, nor, so long as his argument is pertinent and logical, do I see how they affect the conclusions deduced. It is always a sign of weakness to condemn any cause because its advocates may be supposed not to be worthy of respect or credit.

To those who like "Fidelis," and presumably Mr. Hobson also, regard the complete subjugation and excision of the "animal apotheosis" in man as the sole end and aim of moral reformation, there must be something absolutely sacrilegious, if not extremely painful to contemplate, in any proposed relaxation of the marriage laws, or even in discussing the question at all, and they ought strictly to plead for the making of eunuchs, or other enforced states of celibacy. On the other hand, while admitting that the highest union of man with woman, as indeed of man with man, is through spiritual and intellectual fellowships, we who differ from them as to the use and abuse of marriage believe that the sexual instinct in man was no more designed exclusively for the propagation of the species than that it was intended as a source of temptation merely to facilitate the work of our undoing through the lust of the flesh. With St. Paul we say "marriage is honourable in all and the bed undefiled," and as "God has made us so," He sanctions and intends the gratification of this as of every other sense according to Nature's law, when that law is honestly and rationally interpreted. Our health in the majority of cases requires that "they twain"—two sexes, not two (and only two) persons—should be "one flesh." The desirability of a man having or not saving a wife must depend upon his constitution and the traits of character, animal and intellectual, which he develops. Who endorses this principle more clearly than St. Paul, when he speaks of "the gift of continency?" But to quote the Apostle as enforcing monogamy upon all men, because he enjoins it upon the ministry as a matter of expediency, seems a strained and unfair inference. And equally unfair, as it seems to me, is it to quote our Lord's words on the divorce of Jews under special conditions, as implying either the absolute prohibition of divorce in all cases, or the condemnation of polygamy, in both of which senses I understand Mr. Hobson to refer to them. It would be well if on these points he would not only carefully read the three pamphlets your reviewer mentions, but also Milton's "Doctrine and Discipline of Divorce," and "Marriage and Divorce," by Ap. Richard.

Polygamy, if—as admittedly it was—it be sanctioned by the law of Moses, with a view to the promised seed, could not be in itself essentially evil, and our Lord did not condemn it; for He knew too well "what was in man," and that though "from the beginning it was not so"—how could it be in the case of Adam and Eve?—yet that, while honour should be given to the weaker vessel, the two sexes are differently constituted. For a woman to have two husbands at the same time is not only prohibited by God's revealed, but by His natural law, and the abuse of this great physiological precept is followed by awful disease and death as nature's revenge for the crime of polyandry, or for excessive sexuality; but a properly regulated polygamy is conducive to longevity and vigour. Far from us be the abuses of the East or of the Salt Lake City! The two great factors which constitute the difficulty in this matter are the means to keep one, much less two families, as one of your correspondents says, and also the jealousy between the wives. That both these obstacles could be overcome I have no doubt by means of clearly recognised and impartial gradations, which would cement the household together in a common bond of union, and diminish the facilities for undue favouritism.

Under the "one woman at a time" theory of plural marriage, I take it that no sensible person would desire license to "cast off a woman when tired of her." In England we are too strict, as in America they are too eccentric and easy going, in the matter of divorce. Save us from either extreme! But bind one indissolubly to lunacy, hysterical or kindred mania, drunkenness, or the skilled Maybrickian Bluebeard, male or female, this is hell on earth, not the bond which love alone creates and dissolves in the marriage "instituted by God in the time of man's innocency." And still further to press the iron into one's soul, after refusing to allow him to break such a miserable chain, is a man or a woman to be compelled to live celibate for the rest of their lives? Truly do our marriage laws need alteration, if only polygamy were to be permitted where divorce is refused from one who has to all intents and purposes ceased to be a helpmeet in any sense.

I send you, Sir, my name and address, but as I am a clergyman, and do not wish to be "unfrocked," like the author of "Hagar," for expressing views which might be considered by my diocesan, as by his, to be deserving only of deposition, though they are perfectly

sincere, and based, I fully believe, on the laws of God, both revealed and natural, I will subscribe myself,

AUDI ALTERAM PARTEM.

UNIONISM AND THE E.C.U.

SIR,—In the *Gloucestershire Chronicle* of April 29th there is a full account of the annual meeting of the English Church Union at Dursley. If you can find room, Sir, for reprinting a long extract from the address of the Chairman, I do not think it will be space wasted. I have headed this letter "Unionism." The title has only indirectly to do with the union of political parties to prevent certain injustice, politically and religiously, to a large proportion of our Church in Ireland and all Protestant bodies, should ever Home Rule pass and a Nationalist Parliament be allowed to rule in Ireland under the guidance of Archbishop Walsh and his co-religionists. The union of our kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland is a vital matter with all classes who know anything of what Home Rule means, but the union of our Church at this crisis amongst all its members, clergy and laity, should be even a matter of more vital importance, when the question is, "Shall we preserve a National Religion?" I do not know how far the Chairman of the E.C.U. meeting at Dursley is to be taken as the mouthpiece of that body. I have not the honour of personal acquaintance with the President of the E.C.U., Lord Halifax, but if I may judge of his lordship's public speeches in defence of the Church in Wales and definite Christian education in our schools, I should come to the conclusion that the meeting of clergy at Dursley did *not* represent his lordship's views. I believe Lord Halifax to be honest in his convictions, therefore I believe that if the sentiments of the following extract are his lordship's view of the position of the Pope and the lines to be adopted for the reunion of Christendom, then those sentiments would have found utterance in some speech or other when opposing the Welsh Suspensory Bill and Christian training. Here is the extract from the report of the *Gloucestershire Chronicle*:—

"For his own part, he regarded Establishment as an unmitigated evil—(applause)—which cramped and confined the spiritual activities of the Church, paralysed her administration of discipline, and hindered her from adapting herself to the rapidly-changing needs of the times. With regard to Reunion, they earnestly desired it both with Rome and with Geneva. (Applause.) It was, however, impossible save under the primacy of the Premier See of Christendom. That primacy—one of honour, not of jurisdiction—was conferred as the Œcumenical Council of Chalcedon told them, by the 'fathers' upon 'the throne of elder Rome, because that was the imperial city.' That privilege had never been abrogated; it could never be forfeited save by the action of the whole Church. The difficulties in the way were now greater than before the definition of Papal infallibility; but something might be done by way of preparation—(1) They should endeavour to minimise rather than to exaggerate points of difference, remembering also that, through ignorance and prejudice controversialists attributed to Rome doctrines which Rome herself would deny to be *bonâ fide;* (2) They should be quite sure that they, as English Catholics, held all doctrine which East and West held in common." (Applause.)

I prefer to draw the attention of your readers to what I think is the most objectionable part of this opening address by some relevant quotations to making my letter unreasonably long by comments. The speaker must confess that men of authority and worth in our Anglican Church do not regard "Establishment as an unmitigated evil." Honest conviction of the blessings from Heaven on our Church as "Established" would be accorded, I imagine, by all right-thinking men to the whole of our Episcopal Bench, who are heartily opposing this W. S. Bill and showing the loss Disestablishment and Disendowment would be to the nation at large, and specially to country parishes and the poor.

The speaker at Dursley thinks "Re-union impossible save under the Primacy of the Premier See of Christendom," *i.e.*, the Pope. He ignores the whole past and more recent history of the British Church. He ignores one of the latest Encyclicals of Leo XIII. (*Tablet*, Nov. 14, 1885), in which his Holiness and England's Liberator urged the attention of all faithful Roman Catholics to the propositions of the *Syllabus* issued by his predecessor, and in which he fully confirmed them, which condemn free speech, free writing, a free press, toleration to Nonconformity, liberty of conscience, the study of civil and philosophical matters in independence of ecclesiastical authority, marriages unless sacramentally contracted, and the definition by the State of the civil rights of the Church; in which *Syllabus* there is therefore demanded for the Church of Rome and the Pope of Rome the claim to define all civil rights, together with a divine right to be lord paramount in all affairs religious and civil (Vatican Decrees, p. 42). These intolerant claims were fully endorsed by Pope Leo XIII. Cardinal Manning addressed the assembled prelates of the Roman Catholic Church in 1859:—"It is good for us to be here in England. It is yours Right Reverend Fathers to subjugate and to subdue, to bend and to break the will of an Imperial race . . . England is the head of Protestantism, the centre of its movement, and the stronghold of its power. Weakened in England, it is paralysed everywhere; conquered in England, it is conquered throughout the world." The speaker at Dursley, and all who may endorse his views, would do well to read the words of the present Archbishop of Canterbury at a late public meeting and in Convocation in reference to the Reformation, and see how his Grace regards that crisis in the history of our British Church. I do not know whether the views of an Archbishop, who is very far from condemning the Reformation, will weigh an atom with the E.C.U. speaker; as little possibly as the writings of Cranmer, Ridley, Latimer, Hooper. Jewell, and the judicious Hooker; in our memory, Turton of Ely, Philpotts of Exeter, and the Brothers Wordsworth; but I am inclined to think that the majority of your readers, Sir, will come to the conclusion that Bishop Samuel Wilberforce was not far wrong when he said, shortly before his death, that there was a conspiracy in the Church of England to bring it over to the Church of Rome. At the meeting of the E.C.U. at Dursley the idea seemed to be that the E.C.U. should have one great object, the Reunion of Christendom by England's Church submitting itself to "Primacy of the Premier See of Christendom." Infallibility, Immaculate Conception, Mariolatry, Transubstantiation, are matters *de fide*, and are of course mere trifles! If the E.C.U. thinks thus, let a little careful study be given to Bishop Christopher Wordsworth's Anti-Romish opinions in his work on the New Testament, specially on the Book of Revela-

tion. If an older authority is required in addition to Jewel's apology, let me draw attention to South's Sermons, vol. i., 536, 537, Bohn's edition, 1850. I do not wish to hold Lord Halifax responsible for the Anti-Church of England now propounded by this E.C.U. meeting. but Disestablishment and Disendowment want no better help than the sentiments of the chairman of the Unionist (?) meeting at Dursley. A. D. PRINGLE.

Blakeney, May 6th, 1893.

WHAT IS CHRISTIANITY?

SIR,—Perhaps some of your learned correspondents may be able to answer the question with which I have ventured to head my letter. The reply would once have been, "The state of a Christian, *i.e.*, of a believer in Christ." And some colour appears to be given to this old-fashioned view by a passage in the Acts of the Apostles, to the effect that the disciples were called Christians first at Antioch. It is pretty clear, however, that Antioch and London—Liverpool too, from what we read in your columns—differ in their definition of Christianity; the difference is rather in favour of Antioch. On the London School Board "Christian" means some one who does not believe in the Trinity. Well, like the law, the School Board may be a "hass" But what about the *Guardian*, which remarked last Wednesday, "We have no wish to withhold the title of Christians from Unitarians if they like to claim it." The *Guardian's* Christianity is indeed communistic, but it apparently resembles primitive Christianity in nothing else.

Which brings me back to my question, What is Christianity? Will the *Guardian* please tell us, or the Unitarians, or even the London School Board. Of course we might find out by the exhaustive process. Christianity does not consist in faith in the Trinity (which we once "fondly" imagined), and it appears not to be contained in the Scriptures (where I, for one, have hitherto been fool enough to look for it). But this system is tedious Has no one got any precise information? It may be in the "Newcastle Programme;" perhaps it is pigeon-holed somewhere among the agenda of the London County Council. I pause for a reply. PUZZLED.

SUGGESTIVE OUTLINES FOR TEACHERS AND LAY WORKERS, THE PULPIT, PLATFORM, AND DESK.—Christ and Nicodemus. Read St. John iii. 1-15.—We notice how deeply interested and impressive Nicodemus was that Christ was a great Teacher; he confessed that no one could do as He did without God was with Him. He no doubt was, and is, the greatest Teacher; no one could speak and teach like Him. Jesus now takes the opportunity of telling Nicodemus that we must be born again, that is, we must be changed by the power and spirit of God. Nicodemus could not understand this, like many at the present time; they appear not to grasp or comprehend this question, they think it is something very problematic and hard to understand, whereas it is very simple, everything is done for us, there is nothing we can do, for Christ has finished the great work of Atonement and reconciliation; all things are ready, only come and partake. Jesus plainly sought to impress and teach Nicodemus this doctrine, He did not leave him half taught on this very important subject. This is a lesson to us that we should never grow tired to impress on the minds of our hearers, whether young or old, with great earnestness and prayer, the great fundamental doctrines of Holy Scripture. Notice the absolute power of Christ over sin, He fully overcame its power by His death. This is great encouragement for us; there is nothing we have to fear. there is nothing for us to foster any doubt; everything was carried out so that not a shadow of any misgivings need be entertained in the heart. Jesus, then, is the only way of salvation. No matter what man may say we can only accept the Scripture authority as our rule of faith. What a glorious thought that Christ died to deliver us from the power of sin and Satan. This, indeed, was the primary object of Christ's coming into the world, that He was to abolish the power of him who firmly swayed over the human family. Thus it behoved Christ to snap asunder this fearful and cruel bondage. He thus finished the stupendous work of redemption and salvation for us. We thus make a sad mistake to go away from Christ, but should cleave to Him even in our social gatherings. We should not be unmindful of him at festive gatherings, like the Marriage in Cana Jesus was invited with others. Yes, we make a mistake when we shut out Christ, He should be our guest. We find Christ was not unmindful in being the guest at the marriage feast. There is no doubt that He enhanced the pleasure of this party. We fear among the many similar gatherings of the present century that Christ is hardly thought of, much less invited. Jesus speaks with power and authority before this company, and He spoke the same before Nicodemus. Do not mistake, not with any worldly ostentation, but with a loving and gentle manner does He address them. But you may behold there was a manner and style unlike the great of this world when He speaks, and it is done Jesus demonstrates His divinity by His power, no one could do and speak like Him; Jesus makes us happy and joyful, and is able to drive away all things that disturb our peace. Jesus is a true and loving friend, or He would not have demonstrated it by His life and character in the manner He did. Hence how important it is that we make Him our loving and true friend and cleave to Him like Nicodemus. Yes, this friend sticketh closer than a brother, this is what we want. We see in the character of Christ the manifestation of His power demonstrated, His glory, and hence confirms and strengthens His people. It is a good thing to be confirmed and settled in our minds and heart about things of importance. There have been many opinions expressed about Jesus; some have taken Him as their friend and salvation but, alas! others have rejected Him. Have you believed in Jesus? Do you see His power? Do you rejoice in Him as your Saviour? Do you think He is able to save you? Do you think you can be saved in some other way? There is only one name that we can name in order to be saved, that is Jesus; Nicodemus was told this. He alone brought salvation, He alone died on the Cross to save us from our sins and bring us to God, He indeed was lifted up on the Cross that whosoever believeth shall be saved and have everlasting life. Notice a few practical thoughts for our consideration: — 1. Christ the greatest Teacher. 2. Christ teaching the new birth. 3. Christ teaching Nicodemus. 4. Christ, His power over sin. 5. Christ the only way to salvation. 6. Christ gave His life for our sake. "Come unto Me and I will give you rest." Behold, now is the day of salvation.—THOMAS HEATH, Plymouth.

THE late Mr. Francis Edward Guise, many years Recorder of Hereford, has bequeathed his library to the Dean and Chapter of Hereford.

THE Archbishop of Canterbury has fixed Thursday and Friday, July 13th and 14th, for the meeting of the Diocesan Conference at Lambeth.

WE are asked to state that the Bishop of Capetown was at the last moment obliged to postpone his visit to England, and therefore is not a passenger on the *Drummond Castle*.

THE Bishop of Melbourne has issued a circular inviting the clergy in his diocese to observe Wednesday next as a day of humiliation in view of the financial troubles through which the colony is passing.

THE next full meetings of the Central Council of Diocesan Conferences will be held at the National Society's House on Wednesday and Thursday in next week. Amongst the subjects to be discussed are Secondary Education, Welsh Suspensory Bill, Impoverished Benefices, Primary Education, and the present action of the Education Department.

CHURCH OF ENGLAND SANITARY ASSOCIATION.—Lord Randolph Churchill wrote expressing his "entire sympathy with the contention of the Association that the organisation of the Church should be used for the dissemination of right views on sanitary questions." In his absence the Archdeacon of London presided. Sir Spencer Wells, in the course of his paper upon "A Sanitary View of the Parochial System of the Church of England," said the Church of England was essentially a sanitary association. She taught temperance, soberness, and chastity. It was impossible to overrate the influence upon the nation for good of the Church's parochial system, which secured for every parish at least one well-educated man, whose vocation it was to develop in all whom he could influence not only sound minds, but also sound bodies, "as well for the body as the soul." The aim of the Association was to secure for all pure air, pure water, more wholesome food, and more healthy dwelling-places, and in some coming age, not too remote, to stamp out contagious and infective diseases. To this end every parish in the United Kingdom should have its parochial sanitary aid association, consisting of the incumbent, the Nonconformist minister, the health officers, the resident doctors, and the chief parishioners generally. The corner-stone of the parochial system was the old parish church, and that should be an object-lesson of what a house ought to be. It should be well ventilated, and free from all dust, damp, and mouldiness, with the dim religious light dear to the poet brightened by the sunlight of the natural philosopher. It should, moreover, be a place where the congregation could meet without danger of cold in winter, or heat or drowsiness or headache in summer; where they would not be poisoned by emanations from decaying bodies below and around; and where they would not breathe over and over again the combined exhalations from their own lungs, mingled at evening service with the products of the combustion of gas. With regard to the disposal of the dead, as long as the existing method prevailed, it was impossible adequately to protect the living from infection. The principle involved in the words of committal, "earth to earth, ashes to ashes, dust to dust," should be accepted and acted upon, and the ancient practice of purification by fire revived. The excellent publications of the Ladies' Sanitary Association, the National Health Society, and the Manchester and Salford Sanitary Association, would prove useful guides to all who desire to work for the general well-being. By assisting science in giving to our country a healthy and long-lived population, the Church of England could not fail to contribute to the real and lasting welfare of the nation.

ARCHDEACON HANS HAMILTON (Northumberland) held his visitation in Hexham Abbey and in Newcastle Cathedral last week, and in the course of his charge alluded to a proposal for the employment of "cavalry curates," in order to make sufficient spiritual provision for the isolated families of the hinds, shepherds, and others engaged in agriculture throughout the enormous areas over which their rural parishes extended:—"It is therefore now proposed that during the present year, under the sanction of the Bishop, a special conference be held in each of the rural deaneries which embraced these vast county districts, at which the Rural Dean and the clergy, together with the representative laity who are associated with them, undertake to mark upon a map the positions where they are of opinion small chapels of wood or iron, capable of seating from thirty to fifty persons, ought to be erected; and that arrangements be made for the services of these chapels, and for the other spiritual ministrations among the people, by providing mounted clergymen, who might well be known as 'cavalry curates,' each to be supplied with an active pony. These clergymen would be licensed by the Bishop, and act under the direction of the ruridecanal conference. They would reside in agricultural districts appointed by authority, and discharge their duties in those parishes only in which the incumbent had signified his approval and consent. Each of these 'cavalry curates' would be able to celebrate divine services on Sundays in three of these county chapels, and also to give three cottage lectures during the week in three other chapels. He would further visit the sick and aged in each of these remote districts, circulate useful books and tracts, catechise the children, advise the parents, guide the young men and women, and carry out the many other administrations of the Christian ministry. If we are able, with earnestness and unanimity, to lay before the members of the Church, who have already given such efficient assistance, a well-considered and sensible scheme for carrying out those holy purposes, we shall certainly in the next ten years have the privilege of restoring the ancient (we might almost say the primitive) position of the Church of Northumbria, founded by Aidan and Cuthbert, by Bede and Paulinus, when, through the zeal of their teaching, the Christian religion in its pure and apostolic form was so brought home to the whole population, that Christianity became universally adopted, and has been handed down to us, with an Episcopal succession of our own, derived from Ireland through Iona and Lindisfarne, from St. Patrick and St. Columba, and wholly independent of those other Missions from Rome and Gaul which brought the light of the Gospel to the more southern kingdoms of the heptarchy. The faithful adherents of the Church have, during the last decade, contributed to the Bishop of Newcastle's fund on an average £10,000 a year; and if only half this amount be placed for a similar period at the disposal of the Diocesan Society, all which is now suggested may be accomplished, and then we shall have renewed cause of rejoicing before God, that He put it into the hearts of His people of this generation to restore to Northumberland in our time her ancient Episcopate, which was at first founded at Lindisfarne by King Oswald in the year of our Lord 635.

PREFERMENTS AND APPOINTMENTS.

Bannister, Rev. Alfred, M.A. ; Rector of Aston, Ludlow, and Vicar of Elton (by dispensation of the Archbishop of Canterbury).
Child, Rev. A. G., B.A.; Licensed to Officiate in the Diocese of Chester.
Cluff, Rev. William Charles, M.A. ; Rector of Lower Hardres, Canterbury.
Dickenson, Rev. Montague Cecil ; Vicar of Whenby, Yorkshire.
Gore, Rev. Charles, M.A., Principal of the Pusey House, Oxford ; Vicar of Radley, Abingdon, Berkshire.
Hammond, Rev. Robert Henry, Vicar of St. James's, Toxteth Park, Liverpool ; Vicar of St. Mary's, Sheffield.
Hicks, Rev. Francis Thomas ; Vicar of Gayton, Norfolk.
Hildyard, Rev. William ; Rector of Wolterton-with-Wickmere, Norfolk.
Hill, Rev. Harry Ernest, M.A. ; Licensed Preacher in the Diocese of Canterbury.
Hodgson, Rev. W., M.A., Curate-in-Charge of St. Michael's, Claughton ; Vicar of Widnes.
Hogarth, Rev. William John, Curate-in-Charge of Morvah, Penzance ; Vicar of Great Saling, Braintree, Essex.
Hudson, Rev. E. T., M.A., Curate of Ordsall ; Vicar of St. George's, Nottingham.
Hunt, Rev. R. G., M.A.; Vicar of St. Matthew's, Islington.
Hurd, Rev. Walter Robert ; Rector of Flowton, Suffolk.
Jones, Rev. James Davenport, M.A. ; Rector of Tempsford, Bedfordshire.
Lowndes, Rev. Ernest Campbell. Vicar of St. Oswald's, Chester ; Chaplain to the High Sheriff of Cheshire (Mr. R. de C. Vyner).
Mawson, Rev. Hector ; Vicar of Eastwood, Bucks.
May, Rev. Walter Dunstan, M.A. ; Vicar of Brabourne, Kent.
Moll, Rev. William E., M.A., Curate of St. Mary's, Soho, London ; Vicar of St. Philip's, Newcastle-on-Tyne.
Morton, Rev. E. H.; Rector of Tooting Graveney.
Nesbit, Rev. R. B., Vicar of South Cowton, Northallerton ; Vicar of Easby, near Richmond, Yorkshire.
Nugent, Rev. E. F., late Curate of Finningham, Suffolk; Domestic Chaplain to the Bishop of Truro.
Pain, Rev. Rupert William, M.A. ; Vicar of Brockenhurst, Hants.
Parr, Rev. Edward R., M.A., Vicar of Chertsey ; Surrogate for the Diocese of Winchester.
Pickup, Rev. F., M.A. ; Vicar of Ninebanks, West Carshield, Allendale, Northumberland.
Powell, Rev. Arthur Herbert, M.A., Curate of Battersea ; Vicar of St. John-the-Evangelist, Waterloo-road.
Reed, Rev. Samuel, M.A., Rector of Llanerfyl, near Welshpool, and Rural Dean of Caereinion ; Chaplain to the High Sheriff of Montgomeryshire (Mr. Hilton).
Robinson, Rev. Henry, M.A., Vicar of Grosmont ; Vicar of St. Maurice's, York.
Rolfe, Rev. Charles John, B.A.; Rector of Burlingham St. Andrew-with St. Peter, Norfolk.
Russell, Rev. James M., Curate of Hexham Abbey Church ; Vicar of Edlingham, Alnwick.
Sandys, Rev. Samuel, M.A. ; Vicar of St. John's, Great Marsden, Burnley.
Short, Rev. W. F., M.A., Rector of Donhead St. Mary, Salisbury ; Chaplain to the Sheriff of Devon,

CLERICAL OBITUARY.

Allen, Rev. Ernest James, B.A., formerly of Keble College, Oxford, at the High School, Beverley, on the 5th inst., aged 38.
Bateman, Rev. Josiah, M.A., Rector of Southchurch, and Hon. Canon of Canterbury, on the 8th inst., in his 91st year.
Boothby, Rev. Henry Brooke, of Lissington Rectory, Lincoln, at Hasfield Rectory, Gloucester, on the 30th ult.
Cardew, Rev. George, formerly Rector of Helmingham, Suffolk, at St. Minver, East Lyss, on the 2nd inst., aged 82.
Chretien, Rev. Charles P., of Oriel College, Oxford, and late Rector of Cholderton, Wilts, at Bexley-heath, on the 3rd inst., aged 72.
Norman, Rev. James Charles, twenty-three years Vicar of the parish, at the Vicarage, Highworth, on the 1st inst., aged 77.
Tubbs, Rev. George Ibberson, at Dilaram, Boscombe, on the 3rd inst., aged 80.

FIRST REMOVE THE CAUSE.

MEN frequently worry and trouble themselves a great deal in trying to cure the symptoms of vital weakness' nervous exhaustion, and kindred ailments, instead of endeavouring to first remove the cause. This can be done by Mr. Harness' Electropathic Treatment without the aid of drugs. It is useless to tell sufferers to employ their minds and bodies in useful work and to forget their disorders, so long as the cause of their troubles is not removed. How can it be expected that when they are fatigued by the least exertion they can occupy themselves by studying, walking, or other exercise? Even in conversation they frequently lose the thread of it and repeatedly find their memory failing them. What can they do? Physic will not cure them—perhaps the leading physicians have failed to afford them any relief, and they have consequently become hopeless. It is to such as these that Mr. Harness' new combined Electropathic Belt and Suspensory is so strongly recommended, as, by its gentle but continuous action, invigorating electric currents are imperceptibly generated and conveyed direct from the spinal cord to the affected parts. It is this scientifically constructed and convenient appliance which silently but surely acts upon the vital organs, and removes the cause of the patient's disease, effecting a wonderful change in his health, character, and conduct, and speedily enabling him to return to his natural tastes and habits, and enjoy once more the full vigour of youth, with all its accompanying pleasures.

We may add that this perfect Electro-medical appliance is exceedingly comfortable to wear, gives wonderful support and vitality to all the internal organs of the body, prevents chills, imparts new life and vigour to the debilitated constitution, stimulates the organic action, promotes the circulation, assists digestion, and promptly renews that vital energy, the loss of which is the first symptom of decay. Its healing properties are multifarious. It stimulates the functions of various organs, increases their secretions, gives tone to muscle and nerves, relaxes morbid contractions, improves nutrition, and effectually renews exhausted nerve force. Acting directly on the system, it sustains and assists its various functions, and thus promotes the health and vigour of the entire frame. Besides these benefits, the mind is maintained in a buoyant, cheerful state, and every faculty is stimulated to the highest condition of intellectual strength.

Gentlemen who read the above announcement have only to visit London and call at the Electropathic and Zander Institute (52, Oxford Street, W.) to be convinced of the marvellous curative powers of Electricity and Mr. Harness' perfect methods of imperceptibly applying the current. The medical officers of the establishment are in daily attendance, and may be consulted free of charge either personally or by letter.

The Church of England Pulpit.

THE INWARDNESS OF THE SPIRITUAL LIFE.

By the Very Rev. G. W. KITCHIN, D.D.,
Dean of Winchester.

Sermon Preached before the University of Cambridge, on Sunday, April 23rd, 1893.

"Behold, the Kingdom of God is within you."—Luke xvii. 21.

THIS is introspection preferred before circumspection. It matters little, it would seem, that God is around us, if we know not that He is within.

The world is full of anxieties and inquiry as to what is without; we wrap ourselves away from ourselves, as in the folds of a daily newspaper. For it seems hopeless to search into oneself, most disagreeable, always baffling, and we readily think it a vain thing—vain in both senses—to search our heart for the Kingdom of God; yet there it is; not "Lo here! or Lo there!" not in the growth or decadence of empires, not in the rise and fall of Churches, not in the outward manifestations of an aimless so-called spirit-life, nor even in the cherished mysteries of a Church, important as they are. It is when the simple Christian is on his knees some quiet night, when nothing great is doing, nor is the sky ablaze with portent-fires, then it is that the still small voice is heard, a voice unheard by grosser ears, yet clear and true, telling the soul that it is in some deep sense "Partaker of the Divine Nature," and solving the deepest problem of our being by giving us an assurance of eternal life.

To this introspective view of our faith Eastertime ever calls us. Before Easter Day, good pious souls, sin-laden, or perhaps even because they are anxious to realise their sinfulness and to reach a proper frame of mind, have spent a fearsome forty days, engaged on those exercises which, at best, can lead us only to a knowledge of our weaker selves, or seeking to revive their consciousness of our dependence on the Redeemer's loving sacrifice for us. But once the tragic hour is past, these penitential exercises give place to things of higher worth, and Christianity, as a living, elevating power, a life-giving spirit, begins to bring us into another world. The "destructive part" gives place to the "constructive." Lent may have bidden us "know ourselves" for the ejection of the evil within, till we are clean swept and garnished; but Easter, with the voice of a newly awakened springtide of our spiritual year, bids us acquaint ourselves with God, with the indwelling of the Divine Life, with the blessings opened to us by the rending of the Veil, by the victory over Death.

Perhaps in our day the Church has swung over too much to the darker side, emphasising the sadder aspects of Christianity, the tearful, solemn spectacle of the Cross. We miss the higher lesson of the advance and natural development of the Christian life. No doubt, the one-sided introspection of Lenten penitence is better than the world's vague contentment with things as they are; still, it is negative, at best purgative, a Purgatory, a condition out of which we must strive to rise—

> "On stepping-stones
> Of our dead selves to higher things."

For if we only succeed in binding ourselves down to rules of discipline, we shall but abide in the district of the σῶμα ψυχικόν, in the regulation of our lower nature; and this would be little more than an attempt to work out our salvation without recognising the true links of connection between our present and our future life: it would assure us of the Death unto Sin, without teaching us that we have become "alive unto God through Jesus Christ our Lord."

It is this Easter view of the relation of God with man that I desire to consider to-day; to trace out, however weakly, the conception of our human nature regenerated by the rising of Christ from the dead, made capable of immortality, and by reason of the spiritual life enjoying even here and now the first beginnings of the Kingdom of Heaven. These things are rather implicit in Holy Writ than definitely stated; yet the devout student of the New Testament may come to feel that after all the later Covenant, while it does not profess that vouchsafed presence of the Almighty which forms the special mark of the Old Testament, has given us in its stead a still higher boon by relating the spiritual nature within it to the highest gift of God to man, the gift of His presence through the Holy Spirit. It is in fact just the difference between the influence on man of the doctrine of the Unity of God and that of His loving care for us as expressed in the Christian doctrine of the Holy Trinity.

May it be given us to catch even a glimpse of the potential qualities of our being, a spiritual nature within us, distinct from and higher than all that physiology or morals or even psychology can discover in us; a germ of true life, forming, if one may venture on the phrase, a transcendent fourth nature in man, which may almost seem to answer to that fascinating "Fourth Dimension," over which dreamers love to stretch the wings of their imagination, soaring beyond the intelligible limits of things, the bounds of our experience. To lay down in hard lines the quality of this higher element in us would be impossible; as with the Divine

Nature, so with the human, there are depths which we cannot fathom; and, above all, there is a personal life, related to, even analogous to, the life of Christ in His Church, which is the key to all our mysteries of being, of eternal hope; which teaches us to feel the sacramental bonds that draw us near to God.

"When souls are great, they see with other eyes."

Herein lies true second sight, in the glimpses of higher things, vouchsafed to more spiritual natures. It is this power of "other sight" which in the world of letters marks out the man of genius; for it overflows into his style, which shines illumined by the power of special insight and appreciation of truth. The Bible is full of this high quality; and nowhere does it show itself more clearly than in the high impassioned periods in which (1 Cor. xv.) St. Paul faces the mysteries of death, and man's re-creation to a blessed immortality.

II. We are sometimes warned off my text as from dangerous ground. For directly we begin to think of "the glory of this mystery among the Gentiles, which is Christ in us, the hope of glory," we are suspected of falling into company with the Mystics, and they are much accused of being unpractical folk. Thus, for example, we read that "William Law was a Mystic, and the words, 'the Kingdom of Heaven is within you,' are the well from which every mystic must draw. Jakob Behmen first sent Law to this well. To find or know God in reality by any outward proofs, or by anything but God Himself made manifest and self-evident in you, will never be your case here or hereafter." That "the old men should dream dreams and the young men see visions" has always been a terror to even-going people; and the words mystic, visionary, unpractical, revolutionary, rise quickly to our lips. So little faith have we all in the wider horizons, so little can we realise a world beyond the world of sense.

And yet it is not solely the dreaming of a Behmen or a Tolstoi, or the more orthodox aspirations of a William Law. This doctrine of the union of man with God also affects minds of very different stamps. I know an intensely practical man, lord and maker of a great fortune, one standing at the other extreme from the dreamer, who has inscribed these very words, "The Kingdom of Heaven is within you," on the walls and the entrance to his house, because he firmly believes that therein he has found the true answer to his aspirations; the clue to lead him out of the tangle of a busy life. Truth is, that behind every revelation of God there must be mystery, for God is God and we are men; and the revelation of the Holy Scriptures would be self-condemned if it did not raise more questions than it solves. For all revelation must be relative to the state of those who are to receive it; and if man be the lowest of the living creatures to whom God has vouchsafed revelation, we must expect that behind the little knowledge within our reach lies hid an infinite world of further truth, to which we cannot rise as yet. We must expect that further world of truth to be only dimly discernible, even by the best spiritual among us. If

"The soul's dark cottage, battered and decayed,
Lets in more light, through chinks that time has made,"

it is even more true that within the active life of man is a real spiritual life which can receive—not because it is old and worn, but because it is ever young, and vigorous, and eternal—more and more of the Divine afflatus, more and more of the blessed Communion of the presence of God in man, of Christ our Lord. There is no deeper saying in St. Paul than that πνευματικὰ πνευματικῶς διακρίνεται. It is the spirit of man alone that can discern the things of the Spirit of God. For, as says William Law very truly, "Our spiritual life arises from some invisible union with God, or some Divine influence, which, in this state of life, we cannot comprehend." For we are very far from being able to grasp the whole circuit of man's life of sense—how much less the impalpable realities of the Kingdom of Heaven!

The whole is implicit in the doctrine of the Incarnation of Christ. If He has thus closed the rift between us and God, it follows that the theory of Christianity must be based on this union in Him of the human with the Divine. The first man is made in the image of God, the second man in the image of Christ. Else why should Paul cry οὓς πάλιν ὠδίνω, ἄχρις οὗ μορφωθῇ Χριστὸς ἐν ὑμῖν (Gal. iv. 20) to his "little children" among the Galatians, or why should St. Peter speak of our "partaking of the Divine Nature, after we have escaped the corruption that is in the world" thus echoing the "incorruptible" of St. Paul's resurrection chapter? Nor in any other way can we understand the Apostle's splendid burst of confidence (2 Cor. iii. 8), "We all, with open face, beholding as in a glass the glory of the Lord, are changed into the same image from glory to glory, as by the Spirit of the Lord."

It is this application to men of the Incarnation of Christ, by which He triumphed over death, and brought us Easter hopes and blessings, which gives life to the Church on earth, and to each Christian soul among us. This it is that makes the regeneration of the babe a true thing, a first contact of the human spirit with the spirit of the Lord. This gives true force and blessing to Holy Communion; this sanctifies each faithful human breast. Strange that in our straining after reverence, and our attempt to give the Holy Sacrament full honour, we seem destined to endanger the true spiritual virtue of the ordinance; in striving to rise to the level of it, we only draw it down to some material theory, and drop from the spirit to the letter.

The framework of the Church—though the most obvious intent of it may be the spread of the Gospel, and though for that purpose it must cherish

the deposit of doctrine and "the faith"—has also a higher and better object, an object too much overlooked by us, namely, the protection and application of this central faith, the doctrine of the Presence of God in us and with us. If this be forgotten, the framework may indeed continue, with all its massive power of Church, and Priesthood, and ordinances, and may still be a true conservative element in social life; and this has ere now enabled Christianity to bridge over some of the dark abysses of time, protecting a germ which has again sprung into life, after ages of apparent deadness, under the renewed sunshine of the Divine Presence. Still, this outer frame will ever tend to usurp the place of the inner life. We have seen it over and over again. Built as a defence against the powers of darkness, framed as the channel of God's grace, laden with the solemn charge of dispensing His Word and Sacraments, and blessed with His Presence, the Church, as it stands "four square to every wind that blows," has once and again been tempted to materialise herself, and to regard her walls as the end and object of her being. Her bulwarks have become at last bulwarks against the presence of God, rather than the casket for the indwelling of His Spirit. Thus we are apt in our views of Holy Communion to localise the thought of God and to run a risk of giving a material tone to our most spiritual service. The Real Presence of Christ in that Sacrament, the spiritual inheritance of all faithful souls, the deepest and most blessed of all the doctrines of our faith, becomes none the less real by being kept scrupulously clear of all risk of being mistaken for some mysterious manner of physical transmutation or combination. One sees with deep regret that in our Church some seem eager to substitute a Presence in the ordinance for a Presence in the soul of each believer. We multiply our ceremonies, we copy the solemn forms of other Churches, and think thus to do the more honour to the blessed Sacrament. We treat the elements with excess of reverence—a reverence allowable if it simply expressed our thankfulness to God for this deepest mystery of His union with us in Christ, but very dangerous to true religion if it be meant to express a belief that the Divine nature is in any way entangled in material symbols of His Presence. In many ways, too many to be dwelt upon now, men are being trained into a belief in a localised Saviour, into a reliance on the priestly power, into that substitution for our personal union with God of that corporate relation in the Church, against which in former days our forefathers made so brave a stand. Let us not fear to reassert the deeper and more solemn meaning of the Holy Sacrament, remembering the words of Christ, "The Kingdom of God is within you." Thankful as we are for His ordinances, and for the shelter of His Church, we are far more thankful in our souls for Him; His presence in a Christian heart is the true mystery of redemption. The Lord's Supper is, and ever will be, the ordained means whereby we strengthen and refresh our souls, and drink in ever more and more of the Presence of Christ. But the essential matter, the point of the great sacrifice on the Cross, lies first in the preparation of each soul for Christ, and next in the power of the Resurrection, and the new birth of the Spiritual Body.

The tendency to harden everything into a formula has stopped thinking men again and again from looking at the two difficult doctrines of the resurrection of the body, and of the spiritual indwelling of Christ in the human soul. Here we stand on the margin of that higher life, chilled by mists of speculation, fearful to advance. How can we prove that "God is in us of a truth"? How protect ourselves from charges of vagueness, dreaminess, baseless speculations? Why leave the solid ground of fact? Why strive to project ourselves so far? Why speculate on the "verge of the unknowable"? Well, in fact, we find this "verge of the unknowable," the doorway to the Agnostic's lair, in every branch of knowledge. Who is there, Physiologist, Anatomist, Moralist, Psychologist, who does not find at last that he has come face to face with these same difficulties of the limitation of our nature and our knowledge? And if such limitations are found in the worlds of matter, of conduct, of logic and of thought, what wonder if, in pressing onward, we are also confronted with them in this higher sphere? All religion must move along this "verge of the unknowable." In this most solemn land, in which the shadows are so like realities, we must not hope for safety by demanding logical proofs, or think to find God by demonstrating Him; nor can we rest in the fabric of the Church, or in a physical presentment of the Sacraments. Our road—and it is the Scripture path—out of the difficulty lies in recognising the Spiritual Presence of Christ in the soul. To be conscious that "the Kingdom of God is within us" is what we need, though we may never be able to set out the psychological manner of the relation. There exists the promise of this renewed nature in us; there are favoured human beings who seem always to live in the actual presence of and communion with God. To the world they may, like St. Paul, be the "babblers;" to themselves they are the possessors of the kernel of the truth—the truth of the revival within them of the Divine Element by the goodness of Him who died and rose again. "Our spiritual life," says Law again, "arises from some invisible union with God, or some Divine influence, which in this state of life we cannot comprehend." "Had we not this Divine element in us," he adds, "we could no more desire to know anything about God than the worms in the earth can begin to hunger after syllogisms, or crawl about in quest of them." And he adds again that "God within man is his Divine Life, his Divine Light, his Divine Love; while Satan within him is his life of self, of earthly

wisdom, of falsehood, wrath, pride, and vanity. There is no middle way between these two." It is only by prayerful acceptance of the link which binds our souls and God, and by our stedfast endeavour to live according to so high a destiny, that we can hope to triumph in the struggle betwixt what is higher than ourselves and what is lower than ourselves, betwixt God and Satan. Of the fact what thoughtful Christian man can have a doubt? and who would willingly relinquish the hope bound up therewith? Our faith is weak, our power of realising what God has done for us and has in store for us so small, that we live half our lives unconscious of the heavenly gift; nay, we are scared and startled when these stranger thoughts are pressed on us. Then it is that we feel, as Wordsworth puts it, in the "Ode on the Intimations of Immortality"—

> "Blank misgivings of a creature
> Moving about in worlds not realised,
> High instincts, before which our mortal nature
> Did tremble, like a guilty thing surprised."

For eternal life draws our thoughts out of this present world into another world, in which all that we now measure by will avail no more. We think of Heaven by analogies of our present life; we never lose sight of the clock, or of the law of gravity, our clothing and our food, and all the detail of our surroundings. Yet these things are but the shadows, and the things of the spirit the realities. What we can do is to believe that Eternal Life is a state, and not a process, and that it begins here for us, and is as real now as it will be hereafter. And this, because the Presence of the Almighty is not a matter of the future, but of to-day. For "this is Eternal Life, that they may know Thee, the only true God, and Jesus Christ whom Thou hast sent." The deepest chasm of death closes up, and spite of all its terrors ceases to be a "great gulf fixed," for those who live with God while here. The Spiritual Nature in us, even though it may take strange hues of tone and texture from its surroundings of soul and body, is the imperishable portion of our being. Nor will there be break in the sequence and continuity of our true existence. He who has gone before, "to prepare a place for us," remains also with us and in us, the hope of glory. This Christ who has redeemed us from the lower life, who has implanted in us this blessed "particle of the Divine Nature," this *Divinæ particula auræ*, has given us the power of attaining to eternal life. Held by His hand and guided by His voice, we pass inspired through a dangerous world. And here lies the great responsibility and trial of our human existence. We may tread down, beneath the heavy foot of sensuous life, the spiritual power within us; we may "quench the spirit" by wayward folly; we may live as those who have no other life than this. Nay, rather let us who are of the day live as children of the day—children of a Divine Father, heirs of an Eternal Home.

THE KINGDOM OF GOD.

By the Rev. W. E. RAWSTORNE, Hon. Canon of Manchester.

Sermon Preached at St. Thomas' Church, Preston, for the Church Missionary Society, on May 7th, 1893.

"Go thou and preach the kingdom of God."—Luke ix. 60.

σὺ δὲ ἀπελθὼν διάγγελλε τὴν βασιλείαν τοῦ Θεοῦ.

THESE were our Saviour's words to one who seemed to Him to be half-hearted in the great work to which He called him. "Go thou," He said, "and proclaim the Kingdom of God."

It is the work which we hope and trust that our missionary societies are doing. We must try to-day, as our first point, to get a clear idea before our minds of what our Lord meant by this expression, which was constantly on His lips, the Kingdom of God or of heaven. What is it that our missionary societies have to proclaim? And what is the work for which it is our duty to furnish them with the necessary means?

We may have learnt, if we have been students of history, that mistaken ideas of God's kingdom have led to some of the greatest crimes by which Christ's religion has been disgraced—to falsehood and deceit, to oppression and persecution, to wars and massacres. Nor is the danger of such evil things entirely passed away, even in the mild and civilised age in which our lot is cast.

Let us, therefore, begin to-day with a sketch of the Master's teaching about His kingdom, as conveyed in a few well-known texts.

He spoke of that kingdom most solemnly in His last examination by Pontius Pilate. That Roman governor had, no doubt, expected that the prisoner who was then to be brought before him, accused of claiming to be King of the Jews, was one of those physical-force Messiahs, of whom many rose in the closing years of the Jewish state, seeking to found a Kingdom of God by the sword. But our Lord's words were sufficient to convince him that the man who stood before his tribunal, was not one of these, and had no such ambition. "My kingdom," He said, "is not of this world: if My kingdom were of this world, then would My servants fight, that I should not be delivered to the Jews: but now is My kingdom not from hence. . . . To this end was I born, and for this cause came I into the world, that I should bear witness unto the truth. Every one that is of the truth heareth My voice." Only truthful beings yield Him their obedience, and thus become subjects of His kingdom, so that His kingdom may be defined as the aggregate of all sincere truthful minds.

Thus He Himself disclaims all promotion of His kingdom by outward force. That kingdom, which is extended by the exertion of material power, may

possibly in name acknowledge Him, but it is not, and never can be, His own kingdom.

For example, when, in the fourth century of Christianity, a succession of Roman emperors, from Constantine downwards, and especially the great Theodosius, prohibited the practice of the old Pagan religions under pain of death, they immensely extended nominal Christendom, and incorporated in it the whole of the Latin and Greek nations, but the Church which they thus enlarged lost thereby its claim to be called Christ's kingdom.

Or again, when, in the end of the eighth century after Christ, Charlemagne commanded the conquered Saxons to choose between baptism and death, he subdued to the obedience of the Church the whole unconverted remainder of the great German nation; but the institution, which he thus extended, was not Christ's kingdom.

Or, once more, when only a few years ago, a great Roman prelate, Cardinal Lavigerie, proposed a crusade of the united Christian nations to subdue Africa to Christ by force of arms, had his proposal been accepted, the dark Continent might have been added to nominal Christendom, far more rapidly, than it ever will be by the slow process of missionary persuasion; but the kingdom, founded by such means, would not have been the Kingdom of God, for the soldiers of that kingdom do not fight with any weapons, except the sword of the Spirit, which is the Word of God; and Christ's real kingdom never was, and never can be, extended by the use of carnal weapons.

As we write these things, the memory rises unbidden of certain events which happened in Uganda a few months ago. It is possible that the fighting and bloodshed which took place there may have been entirely in self-defence, and therefore excusable; but still it remains, that arms were taken up, and that blood was shed in battle. And Christ's kingdom never can be promoted by any such violent means, but only by the free acceptance of truth by truthful minds; and the only blood that is ever truly shed in His cause is the blood of martyrdom, which we are thankful to be able to say was not wanting in that case.

But, if not by carnal weapons and physical force, perhaps Christ's kingdom may be promoted by such weapons as ecclesiastical bodies have at their command, by powerful organisations, by magnificent buildings, by imposing ceremonies, by splendid processions, functions and parades. Is it so?

The answer to this supposition comes out of another of our Saviour's words: "The Kingdom of God," said our Lord, "cometh not with observation, neither shall men say, Lo, here! or Lo, there! for, behold, the Kingdom of God is within you." Christ's kingdom has no local seat or throne. It has no external exhibition or display. Its progress cannot be watched by spectators, nor pointed out by man's finger, nor indicated by man's tongue. For it is in its essence all within. It is a reigning, a sovereignty, an ascendency, a commanding influence of God and goodness within the heart of man, visible or perceptible to man through the works which it produces, and the characters which it forms, but, in its essence, visible to the Searcher of hearts alone.

Let me add to the texts thus quoted from our Saviour's own lips one text more. There came to Him once a student of the Jewish law who had imbibed from the Hebrew prophets their deeply spiritual ideas, and was therefore ready to accept and embrace the religion of Christ Himself. In answer to this sincere inquirer, our Lord had recited the two great Commandments which form the substance of all God's law; and had drawn from him thereby an expression of hearty sympathy with Himself, and the great object that brought Him into this world. "Well, Master," that scribe had said, "Thou hast said the truth, for there is one God and there is none other but He; and to love Him with all the heart, and with all the understanding, and with all the soul, and with all the strength, and to love his neighbour as himself, is more than all the whole burnt-offerings and the sacrifices." That scribe received an answer which assured him that he had truly described the real nature of the kingdom—"Thou art not far from the Kingdom of God." God's kingdom, as our Lord then indicated, consists of those willing subjects who render loving obedience to Him, and loving service to mankind, their hearts ruled and dominated by those two great Commandments which make up the sum of all God's law.

This, then, is the Kingdom of Christ. Not a vast Christendom, counting some two or three hundred millions of people calling themselves Christians, not a visible external Church, in which it is very doubtful sometimes whether the evil or the good predominate, but a body of men, large or small, whose hearts are overmastered and controlled by God's two great commandments, to love God above all, and to love mankind not less than self, and (if we may bring in here the example of Jesus of Nazareth to raise to a still higher point the second of his Commandments) to love mankind to the point of entirely sacrificing self. It was to found this reign of love and goodness amongst mankind that Jesus Christ came, lived, and died. This was the truth that He taught, and of which before Pontius Pilate He witnessed the good confession. Those whose hearts have embraced that truth are His true subjects, and the sum or aggregate of them constitute His kingdom upon earth.

This, then, is God's kingdom upon earth, or, as St. Paul expressed it, God's building, God's temple, of which Christ is the one foundation, and in which the spirit dwells. And this is the kingdom which missionary societies strive to build and establish, if they be working according to their Master's mind, and on the work which is His own.

The vast outward kingdoms, with their millions

of inhabitants, which we call Christendom, all slightly leavened by Christ's teaching, may be a step nearer to Him than the heathens who follow other masters, but they are not His kingdom.

The outward Church with its professed adherence to His principles and acceptance of His teaching, and with its various means of grace, may be a step nearer still, but neither is it His kingdom, nor can it ever be, until all hearts within it are dominated and inspired by the love of God and the love of man.

Yet each of these—the vast external Christendom and the outward and visible Church within it—may be the necessary means for promoting Christ's spiritual kingdom. Though they are not themselves the building of God, yet they may be the necessary scaffolding, without which that house cannot be built.

So missionary societies may labour to extend Christendom, and also the outward and visible Church; but always must make it their fondest desire and most diligent effort to promote that inward kingdom which, as our Lord taught, is truth —truthfulness and love; or which, as St. Paul taught, in strict harmony with his Master's teaching, though in other words, is righteousness, and peace, and joy in the Holy Ghost. If missionary societies ever neglect this rule, and care more for the outward than for the inward kingdom, their compassing of sea and land to make their proselytes may result in making those converts more children of hell than before, as the Pharisees were accused of doing, or, at the best, will stop far short of making them children of heaven. As in old time our Master held that the love of God and the love of man were more than all the burnt-offerings and the sacrifices of the ancient dispensation, so in the present time we cannot doubt that He holds those two fundamental principles of His far more than all that ecclesiastical organisation, and all those sacraments and ordinances which we, like our predecessors of old, are so apt to put in the first place when they have a right only to the second.

Thus, when we consider the work of a missionary society, we do not ask, first of all, whether its outward adherents from among the heathen are numerous, nor even whether those adherents are diligent and attentive to worship and ceremonial, but whether they have become lovers of God and lovers of man, pure in their own personal life, as God would have them be, and charitable, to the extent of self-denial, in their action towards their fellow-creatures.

And, when we consider the procedure and principles of such a Society, we ask, Does it merely aim at making a fair show in the flesh, by counting in its statistics a multitude of outward converts? or does it give its whole heart to those weightier matters of the law, which our Lord accused the ecclesiastics of his period of neglecting—to that deliverance from vice, and lust, and corruption, which is the true liberty with which Christ makes His people free?

This is the test which must be applied to every missionary society, and the one which solicits our contributions to-day must not shrink from it. It must face the question, Does it preach the Kingdom of God? Does it seek first the Kingdom of God and His righteousness?

Let us, then, consider the action of the Church Missionary Society in this special point of view, as preaching and promoting the true Kingdom of Christ, of God, on earth.

In dealing with this point, I feel it to be a great advantage that I have myself no official connection with the Society, and have never taken any active part in its management. Though a very old supporter and subscriber, I am not one of its engaged and appointed advocates. I often attend its committee meetings in London, which are open to every clergyman who is on its list of members. But I have always been content to take the place of a spectator, and have never spoken a word on any of the questions that have come before its Board of Management. I think that such a spectator can form a more impartial judgment on its spirit and procedure than those who are actually enlisted in its service.

Its tone has always seemed to me very high, and its aims very noble. It would be too much to say, nor would its warmest supporter venture to say, that it had, in every single action, sought only the Kingdom of Christ, of Heaven, of God, without any mixture of a lower aim. But thus much, I think, may be said with truth, that that highest object of human efforts has always with it stood *first;* and that the extension of the earthly Church, which is to many Christians not only *first*, but *all*, has never been to it more than *second*, and that the mere sectarian object of advancing its own special form of Christianity has never stood higher than *third*.

Although a great number of clergymen regularly attend its meetings and take part in its management, yet a leading part in its direction does practically fall into the hands of laymen, for whom religion seldom sinks into that mere professional thing which, sad to say, it often becomes among us clergymen. These lay managers are men for whom religion has been a guide and support in the hard work and perplexing business of life, and whose tendency, therefore, is to hold fast the weightier matters, and to exalt the inner substance above the outer form. Some of them are lawyers, versed in the careful treatment of delicate questions of procedure, and others business men, with commercial relations extending widely over the world. And perhaps the most valuable class of all are devout soldiers of the type of the centurion of Capernaum, or of Cornelius, men of action, not of words, whose religion has stood the test in hours of danger and trial, and who have thus learned to distinguish

the substance from the form—men who know the value of organisation, discipline, obedience, without erecting these into idols, as is the case with many ecclesiastics of the present day. Having seen the inside of various clerical assemblies, and having been acquainted with persons who pull the wires of ecclesiastical movements, I can say that the tone of the mixed lay and clerical committee of the Church Missionary Society is higher than that of those purely clerical bodies whose action I have also witnessed; and I think that it is the large infusion of the lay element that gives to it that higher tone.

And let me mention one other point of excellence in its spirit and action. It lives in hearty sympathy and friendly co-operation with those other free Christian bodies which have won so large a part of the trophies of the Christian mission field. When, for instance, it hears of the Fiji Islands won to Christ by the Wesleyans, or Madagascar by the Congregationalists, or the Karens of Burmah by American Baptists, it is not moved with envy, but can recognise these successes as the signs and seals of a true apostolate, owned by God Himself, as well as known and read by all men. It does not treat these as inferiors, far less as opponents, but as brethren, whom the living Lord has accepted, and to whom His spiritual gifts have evidently been given.

It only now remains to speak of its own particular work in the world. That work is very widely spread—in fact it is world-wide. New Zealand in the far South, Japan and China in the most distant East the Hudson's Bay territory, and even Alaska, in the extreme North and West, with the central countries of the earth, Africa, West and East, Egypt, Palestine, Persia, and India chief of all, are included in its vast range. This Society has been, and is, a witness for Christianity and Christ in all these regions. The extent of its external success may be found tabulated in its returns, and not even its detractors would deny that the figures published make a very fair show in the flesh, if nothing more.

But what must be said of that inward Kingdom of Christ, and Heaven, and God, of righteousness and peace and joy, of love of God, proved by the keeping of His Commandments, and of love of man, proved by unselfish devotion to our brethren's happiness and well-being? Has the Society been equally successful in promoting this kingdom?

It must not shrink from facing this test question, nor does it desire to do so. Indeed, it confesses itself with sorrow that many of its new converts are very weak brethren, needing constant guidance and support, and that from time to time hereditary tendencies, derived from countless generations of heathen ancestors, such as the almost invincible inclination of Africans to works of the flesh, break out in the young Churches with overwhelming force. It has many a scandal to blush for, many a fall to bewail.

But, on the whole, it feels that it has the right to say that the whole body of its converts are lifted nearer to Christ, and to God, and to goodness; that the Christian societies that it has formed are not less virtuous—rather, much more virtuous—than the majority of baptised and professing Christians here at home; and that from among their number there do arise a multitude of true children of God and Heaven, whose light shines before men, and who are ready, like those in Uganda the other day, even to lay down their lives for their faith. The old leaven of heathen ideas and morals is not all purged out—as, indeed, it is not here at home, after 1,300 years of professing Christianity; but the better leaven of the Gospel and of the law of liberty, which came from Christ, is spreading, and will finally prevail.

I will now leave the claims of this Society in your hands to-day. It is doing an honest and good work; it keeps stedfastly before itself the highest aim; it seeks to found no fabric of mere earthly power, but it strives truthfully and perseveringly to extend the Kingdom of God, the reign in the hearts and lives of mankind of truth, and love, and righteousness, and peace—all which are included and embodied in the one name of Christ.

THE Bishop of Ely has now recovered from his recent illness. He is leaving for the Continent, and will be absent till the middle of June. Letters may be addressed to the Palace, Ely, during his absence. His lordship hopes, however, that matters which are not of importance may be allowed to stand over till his return.

THE St. Albans Diocesan Conference will meet at Albans on Wednesday and Thursday, May 31st and June 1st. The following subjects have been selected for discussion:—1. "The Increasing Difficulties of the Church, owing to the Agricultural Depression." 2. "The Licensing Laws, and the Bishop of Chester's Scheme." 3. "Religious Education in Elementary and other Schools."

SUGGESTIVE OUTLINES FOR LAY-WORKERS AND TEACHERS, FOR PULPIT, CLASS, AND DESK. NO. 9.—Repentance: "And saying, Repent ye, for the kingdom of heaven is at hand." (Matt. iii. 2.) Introduction: We notice that the forerunner and herald of Jesus was distinguished as a prophet. We notice that the burden of John's preaching was "repentance." We notice—I. The Preacher: John was powerful and faithful, called to warn the people and tell them of One who was coming after him, who was greater than him. The preacher of the Gospel holds the highest honour and privilege; he is called to proclaim the advent of Christ. II. The Duty enforced: "Repentance." What is repentance? Turning to God. The message concerns every man, for all need repentance. III. The plea by which it is enforced: "The kingdom of heaven is at hand." It is nigh; now you may enter. There is no time to waste; we have no right to put it off, no right to delay. All things are now ready. We cannot tell what a day may bring forth. "Behold, I stand at the door and knock." Oh, enter while ye may. Flee to the refuge set before you. Make haste, or it may be too late.

NOTICES.

All communications respecting the Literary portion of the paper should be addressed to the Editor.

Business communications of every kind should be addressed to Dr. S. Gibbon, at the Church of England Pulpit Office, 160, Fleet Street, London, E.C., to whom cheques and Post-office orders for subscriptions (in advance), three months, 2s., six months, 3s. 6d., twelve months, 6s. 6d., are to be made payable.

The Cases for binding Vol. XXXIV. are now ready.

For Health and Immortality.

The Ecclesiastical Review.

SATURDAY, MAY 20, 1893.

THIS PICTURE—AND THIS.

IT would be too much to say that the opening of the Imperial Institute marked an era in our history, time must tell whether it was even an important event. It is just one of those things which succeed or fail according to the spirit in which they are taken by all concerned; it may become a mere bureau affair, or it may render valuable service in cementing and consolidating our Empire. Much will depend on the way in which it is managed. If *cliqueism* is absent, if there is no suspicion of jobbery, and the Institute is managed in a really liberal and generous fashion, so that the people to whom it may be really useful are actually encouraged to use it, then it will do good service indeed. To that end the memorial must be subordinated to the utilitarian aspect of it; just there danger lies. There is a good deal of the Jack-in-office about us English, and there is considerable risk that those responsible for the direction of the Imperial Institute may regard it as a mere memorial, erected only for external use in commemoration of the Queen's Jubilee and as evidence of the existence of the British Empire, otherwise to be administered for the benefit of the deserving managers and their friends. This spirit has been too lamentably apparent in the management of many of our public institutions. Is it too much to hope that the Imperial Institute may be spared?

But, whatever its future, there is no doubt about the present of the Imperial Institute. It is more than a historical document in brick and mortar to prove the existence of the Empire, it is a tribute to the generous spirit of true patriotism which characterises many Englishmen Here is evidence of the way in which at least a portion of the English nation regards the Empire, which it has taken so many centuries to put together, and that consideration naturally leads us on from South Kensington to Westminster.

When our gracious Sovereign had gathered round her her faithful servants to share in the ceremony of opening the Imperial Institute—a ceremony which in its solemnity, as well as its brilliance, suggested and recalled the Jubilee of 1887—the one man whom we should have expected to see beside her, the man who rules her Empire in her name, was conspicuous by his absence. These absences of Mr. Gladstone are too frequent. When his great political rival was laid to his everlasting rest, Mr. Gladstone kept away; when, later on, the mild and gentle Statesman, who in the stormiest times of politics continued without reproach from any party, ceased from his thankless labours, Mr. Gladstone was not present with a last farewell. In the same manner he kept away from Lord Tennyson's grave. It was only in keeping that he should pointedly absent himself from the most important and Imperial ceremony of the last five years. It is probably Mr. Gladstone's way of revenging himself upon an Empire which exists in spite of him.

It was indeed a different picture which Westminster presented. There the wrangle was just beginning over the dismemberment of the Empire, which at South Kensington Sovereign and people were seeking to consolidate. Naturally Mr. Gladstone could not miss even an hour of it. The Committee on the Home Rule Bill has tackled the first two lines, and in doing so has disclosed a picture of obstinate infatuation and trickery the like of which has never before been witnessed in the House of Commons. Aptly has the Prime Minister been compared to a Homeric deity throwing round his heroes a cloud—of words. To the acutest criticism, the shrewdest logic, Mr. Gladstone can only reply by postponing the most important details and ranting about the iron entering into the Irish soul. Mr. Morley's cue is petulant insolence. Their Irish allies support them by brutal vulgarity and such gutter tricks as anonymous interruptions, couched in low and sometimes filthy language, which they then unanimously deny having made use of.

These were the proceedings which kept Mr. Gladstone away from an Imperial ceremony, and these are the means with which he threatens to break up the Empire. The selfish ambition and lust for power of an old man whose mind is weaker than his body, the crack-brained contrivances of an atheistic and revolutionary philosopher, the coarse and low expressions of a gang of self-seeking demagogues and agitators, these are the forces of disruption, which claim to be carrying out the will of the people. We gladly turn from the shame of Westminster to the brilliance of South Kensington, and trust that the successful inauguration of the Imperial Institute will be a happier and more truthful omen for the future of England.

LAY PREACHING.

THE importance of a good lay sermonizer cannot for one moment be disputed. I admire hearing a good layman preach a sermon. To say there are no good lay-preachers would be saying that which is untrue. There is one thing that we should expect, that is, that those who aspire to preach should be good heaven-taught men, and prepare themselves, by the help of God, as well as they possibly can for the work. There are many who take up this work very lightly, that is, they do not count the cost. The lay-preacher must be fully aware that he has taken a great responsibility on himself—a great, an important work to which he has put his hand. I would like to see more earnest, God-fearing lay-workers. There is plenty of work; there is an extensive field of labour. There is great need at the present time for earnest, suitable, and intelligent men. The Gospel must be preached by those who know its power in their own hearts. We must, with great humiilty, zeal, and tact, be able to divide the Word rightly, and the people who hear must see and feel that we really are in earnest, as having to give account, that we may know by practical and experimental knowledge Whose we are and Whom we serve. The remarks I have thus advanced are equally applicable to the Sunday-school teacher. The more we realise our position as workers in the Lord's vineyard, the less we shall think of our own power and self-glorification, self-interest, and any fostering pride in thinking more highly of ourselves than we ought. We should consider the work is not ours; we simply look to the Master for all necessary blessings and fitness for the work. The Saviour laid His sacred life down for the work of redemption and salvation of man. He finished the work His Father gave Him to do. His whole life was one of great humility when upon this earth of ours; His servants should, therefore, seek to copy His glorious example. The lay-preacher should seek to be a workman that need not be ashamed. As regarding the characteristics of preaching, we may notice a few things along with many others according to our mind, and how we are taught by the wisdom of God :—

1. Our sermons and lessons should be models of simplicity. Look at Christ's!

2. They should be very illustrative. Learn from our blessed Saviour's.

3. They should be distinguished by earnestness and demonstration of the heart in the work. Remember Christ's words: "I must work the works of Him that sent me while it is day," etc.

4. They should contain the message of salvation to the sinner, man's depravity, no human merit, free without money or price, heaven and hell, "Flee from the wrath to come."

5. The sacred Scriptures to be the only rule, guide, and standard of life and duty, learning therefrom that we cannot teach others unless we are taught ourselves.

Let me thus conclude. Those who labour faithfully for Jesus will receive a glorious reward by-and-bye, especially those who have toiled for the bread that perisheth, yet have worked hard for the Master, whether he be a lay-preacher or a Sunday-school teacher. Such will receive a crown which will never fade away, a crown of life that will be imperishable. Toil on, then, ye workers; the work is beyond the conception or proper understanding of the world. A few more years and then we pass over to the other shore, where the sun never sets, and where there is unending joy, and where partings and separations will be no more, and there where God shall "wipe away all tears from our eyes." And there, too, we shall see Jesus face to face, and go no more out for ever.

THOMAS HEATH.

Plymouth.

Reviews and Notices.

"A GARLAND OF THORNS." By Daisy St. Aubyn. London: Eden, Remington & Co., 1 vol. 8vo., 3s. 6d.

DAISY ST. AUBYN, so well known in the weeklies as a favourite writer of short tales, has ventured on a novel, "A Garland of Thorns," and the result shows that she has not miscalculated her powers. The charming portrait of the authoress, which forms the frontispiece, would make one wonder that one so young can have such a knowledge of character and of the world, but for the bright intellect, so unmistakably depicted in her face; indeed it is not often that one sees a portrait in which so much grace and intellect are combined.

The story, though far enough from the penny-dreadful style, begins with a murder, not a deliberate murder, but committed by a tempted woman, with scarce a moment's thought; and the title is well kept to in showing what a "Garland of Thorns" encompasses, not only the guilty wife, but also the man whose evil influence and fascinations made such a dreadful crime possible. The character of this man, Philip Lancier, is admirably drawn and sadly true to nature. The authoress is exceptionally good at description, and manages often in a few lines to make a person, or place, stand out as a picture before the reader's eye. The heroine, Vera Lynne, is of

> "The type more admired by men than women. There would certainly be more danger in this changeable winning maiden, with her luring, yet timid glance, and radiant tintings of complexion, than in a room full of statuesque hard-featured beauties, for the girl's face is radiant with the light which only a noble and generous soul ever imparts to the countenance. Women might have questioned her perfect beauty, but none could have denied the harmony of her features, or disputed their intellectuality. She possesses, too, the additional advantage which intellectual faces often lack, namely, the charm of perfect health, not of a robust coarse kind, but a Titian-like bloom, which is such an attraction to the opposite sex, and is so much envied by women."

A fault in the book, if it be a fault, is that it is perhaps too much condensed, there is quite enough "stuff" in it for the regulation three-volume novel. It wants, moreover, here and there more careful revising, but this will doubtless be done in future editions.

Mrs. Daisy St. Aubyn is a clergyman's daughter, and her work is one that may grace any clergyman's table; its moral, which is steadily kept in view, is "The way of transgressors is hard."

"THE EXPOSITOR." May, 1893. London: Hodder and Stoughton.

AT last we have got, to some extent, our wish, namely, an examination of Professor Marshall's articles. The examination is by Mr. Willoughby C. Allen, of Exeter College, Oxford, whose paper, in substance, consists of a charge of imperfect knowledge of Aramaic against Professor Marshall. In brief, Mr. Allen says that

Professor Marshall "is obliged to coin for words meanings which they never possessed, and to create new constructions which defy grammatical analysis." Now if this charge is true, it is a very serious blow at Professor Marshall's theory. But unfortunately it leads to a field where few can follow. Not everybody can even read his Bible in the Hebrew; very few can read Aramaic. And so the whole issue is, Which is the best Aramaic scholar, Professor Marshall or Mr. Allen? And to help us to solve this difficulty, Dr. Driver writes a little preface to Mr. Allen's paper which entirely avoids this issue—the only issue worth considering. Dr. Driver says, "Mr. Allen writes so clearly and cogently that the philological defects of Professor Marshall's results will be evident, I am sure, even to those readers who have no special knowledge of Aramaic to guide them." Clearness and cogency have nothing to do with the real issue. Whose *facts* are right? If the *facts* are with Mr. Allen, then he must be listened to, though he wrote such English and as confusedly as any provincial newspaper. Whose opinion as to the meaning of Aramaic words, Mr. Allen's or Professor Marshall's must we take? That is what Dr. Driver should have told us, if he can, instead of favouring us with a page and a half of misleading verbiage.

Professor Milligan has a paper on Hebrews vi. 4-6, which is to be concluded next month, when we shall hope to have a word to say about it.

Dean Chadwick writes very well on "The First Storm." Professor Stanton continues his series on the "Synoptic Problem," and Professor Bruce his on "St. Paul's Conception of Christianity."

"THE EXPOSITORY TIMES." May, 1893. Edinburgh: T. and T. Clark.

AS usual, the "Notes of Recent Expositions" are the most interesting part of the magazine, though many papers in it are of great value.

Professor Mayor's "Commentary on St. James's Epistle" is carefully criticised by Mr. Gwillam. The notices of new books are also very usefully written.

"THE THINKER." May, 1893. London: James Nisbet and Co.

WE are sorry the "Thinker" should go in for prize competitions. We are not at all surprised that, out of about ninety papers sent in, "fully one-third" were "below even a very moderate standard of merit." Prizes are all right for little boys; men lose their self-respect by writing for them.

However, of the papers sent in, that by Dr. Biddall on "What is the Church?" is much the best, in our opinion. We quite agree that the real issue between theological disputants is, How far did Christ *organise* His Church? Few will deny that He founded a Society; how far He left directions for its organisation will probably be in dispute until the Church militant becomes the Church triumphant.

"THE CAMBRIDGE COMPANION TO THE BIBLE." London: C. J. Clay and Sons. Pp. 412. Price 3s. 6d. 1893.

THIS volume consists of various papers written by learned men on different subjects connected with th Bible, the structure and preservation of the Hol Word, the natural history of the Bible, its geography geology, botany, etc. There is also a concordance and an entirely new set of maps. We commend the volume to the notice of our readers: it will be found to contain a great deal of very correct and useful information.

CORRESPONDENCE.

To the Editor of the CHURCH OF ENGLAND PULPIT AND ECCLESIASTICAL REVIEW.

WHAT IS CHRISTIANITY?

SIR,—The amusing letter of "Puzzled" in your last week's issue, seems to sanction the *Guardian's* idea that true Christianity is communistic and socialistic. This doctrine I believe to be utterly at variance with the Scriptures, and to be most pernicious. The communism of the first Christian Church is generally held to be a warning rather than a guide to the Church. Socialism is a deliberate reaction against the progress of the world; it resorts to rules of coercion; it distrusts the unit, and makes him the slave of a committee which is to guide and guard the weakness and the corrupt conscience of each. This committee of the national conscience, or the Nonconformist conscience, or the School Board conscience, or the County Council already finds it necessary to enforce by penalty the performance of civil duties and privileges. I am not aware that Christ ever advocated such methods, or said that souls would be saved in communities and societies.

If some of your admirable preachers would enlighten us on the merits and demerits of Socialism, and help us to decide whether the *Guardian* is saying what is in full accord with Christianity, they would confer a lasting benefit on the readers of your excellent paper.

MEDICUS.

May 15th, 1893.

THE WELSH SUSPENSORY BILL.

SIR,—Many of us parsons are so English as to prefer calling a spade a spade. And if taking property bequeathed to the Church for the maintenance and the propagation of the Christian religion, and using it for secular purposes, be not sacrilege, what in the name of wonder is it? If taking the tithes from God's ministers, who are honestly giving their time and powers to the work of the ministry in their allotted cures, be not the very "sacrilege" deprecated by the prophet Malachi—"Will a man rob God?" (chap. iii. 8-10)—what does the prophet mean by "tithes and offerings"?

Sir Osborne Morgan may be excused, perhaps, for calling it "blasphemy" to talk so; for he is not obliged to know what sacrilege is, nor to care for an Old Testament prophet.

But for the *Guardian* to give an uncertain sound when a great danger is impending, may well strike the bravest with dismay—"as when a standard-bearer fainteth!"

Surely the nation is meditating a great sin—a sin that may be the cause of greater calamities than the spoliation of the religious houses at the time of the Reformation:—

"Who can call to mind," says Southey, "without grief and indignation, how many magnificent edifices

were overthrown in this undistinguishing havoc! . . . The founders (of the abbey) had denounced a perpetual curse upon any one who should usurp, diminish, or injure its possessions. . . . By pious Protestants, as well as by Papists, the abbey-lands were believed to carry with them the curse which their first donors imprecated upon all who should divert them from the purpose to which they were consecrated."

There is likelihood of a similar curse attending the alienation of Church property to profane uses now. And it is the duty of all, whether clergy or laity, who think thus to try to keep the Parliament from incurring that dreadful verdict—"Ye are cursed with a curse; for ye have robbed Me, even this whole nation."

G. H. BUTT.

Edlington Vicarage, Horncastle, May 12th, 1893.

MARRIAGE.

SIR,—I think I cannot do better than quote from the life of the good and great Dr. Johnson:—

"Boswell.—So then, sir, you would allow no irregular intercourse whatever between the sexes?"

"Johnson.—To be sure I would not, sir. I would punish it much more than it is done, and so restrain it. In all countries there has been fornication, as in all countries there has been theft; but there may be more or less of the one as well as of the other, in proportion to the force of law. All men will naturally commit fornication, as all men will naturally steal. And, sir, it is very absurd to argue, as has been often done, that prostitutes are necessary to prevent the violent effects of appetite from violating the decent order of life; nay, should be permitted, in order to preserve the chastity of our wives and daughters. Depend upon it, sir, severe laws, steadily enforced, would be sufficient against those evils, and would promote marriage." (Boswell's "Life," 3rd volume, chap. I., 1776, paragraph beginning, "On Friday, April 5. being Good Friday," etc.)

Unfortunately, what is natural is not always right. "Therefore, brethren, we are debtors, not to the flesh to live after the flesh; for if ye live after the flesh ye shall die; but if ye, through the Spirit, do mortify the deeds of the body, ye shall live" Notwithstanding the very plain speaking of St. Paul, some will draw inferences according to their own wishes and predilections; others think that St. Paul was actuated by principle, not expediency.

FIDELIS.

SIR,—When, at your suggestion as made in the PULPIT of April 22nd, I sent you the letter on the above-mentioned subject which you were good enough to publish on April 29th, you will remember that, in a private note accompanying my letter, I expressly requested you not to insert except on condition that you would not allow any letter to appear in your columns in reply to it.

I think I have a right to ask you to insert these few lines in your next issue, as explaining to your readers why I feel exonerated from any obligation to reply to the letter of *Audi Alteram Partem* in last Saturday's PULPIT, and as expressing my surprise that, under the circumstances, you allowed that letter to appear in your columns, with its expressed reference to my letter of the previous week.

W. T. HOBSON.

Douglas, May 15th, 1893.

[Our correspondent only stipulated that we should not answer or comment on his letter ourselves.—ED.]

A SPECIAL meeting of the Ripon Diocesan Conference will be held at the Philosophical-hall, Leeds, at 11 a.m., on Friday, June 2nd, to consider the Welsh Suspensory Bill. The autumn session will take place on the 24th and 25th of October.

ARCHDEACON SINCLAIR will hold his Visitation of the clergy of the archdeaconry of London on Tuesday, the 30th inst., at St. Sepulchre's Church, at 11.30, and for the admission of churchwardens on Monday, the 29th (from 9 to 12 a.m.), and on Tuesday, the 30th (from 9 to 11.30 a.m).

IT is stated that the resignation of Dr. Pelham as Bishop of Norwich finally took effect on Wednesday last, and that within the next few days the Dean and Chapter will proceed to the election of the Rev. John Sheepshanks as his successor. The election will then be confirmed at Bow Church. The consecration of the new bishop is expected to take place on Thursday, June 29th, in St. Paul's Cathedral. The Bishop-designate has appointed Archdeacon Perowne and Canon Garnier as his examining chaplains.

AT the first of the Birmingham archidiaconal visitations, held on the 9th inst., in St. Philip's Church, the Bishop of Coventry expressed regret at the withdrawal of the Birmingham bishopric scheme, but a committee, he said, would still exist, and the subject would be brought before the Church Congress in Birmingham in the autumn. He ventured to hope that donations would be again promised as soon as the new scheme had been submitted. In the meantime local trusts had been formed for the purpose of holding existing funds and such donations and legacies as might be given from time to time.

THE Rev. A. Hamilton Baynes, M.A., has been appointed by the Archbishop of Canterbury to be Bishop in Natal. The Synod of the Church of England in the Province of South Africa and in the Colony of Natal separately committed to the Archbishop by delegation the nomination of their new Bishop. Mr. Baynes was for nearly four years domestic chaplain at Lambeth, for which office he had resigned the vicarage of St. James's, Nottingham, in which he greatly commended himself to both clergy and laity as a true Church of England man, yet a man of very broad religious sympathies and of great devotion to all problems which concern the social well-being of the people. He is an able and eloquent preacher. When he would naturally have resigned the office of Six-Preacher in Canterbury Cathedral he was continued in it by the Archbishop on the express request of the Dean and Archdeacons. He has shown great power of organisation since he was appointed to Christ Church, Greenwich, by the Rev. Brooke Lambert as patron. The Bishop will be immediately subject to the Metropolitan of Capetown. The *Daily Chronicle* says:—"The Council of the Church of England in Natal has resolved to accept the Episcopal administrations of a Bishop consecrated by the Archbishop of Canterbury under a mandate from the Crown, the council still retaining the administration of its properties and the organisation of the Church. The council also agreed to pay half the Bishop's income and rent, the Church of South Africa to pay the other half."

PREFERMENTS AND APPOINTMENTS.

Archer, Rev. Cecil, M.A., ; Chaplain to the *Urgent.*

Armstrong, Rev. James Blakeley, Curate of Sandford Church, Dublin; Principal of the Home and Colonial Training College, Gray's-inn-road.

Baker, Rev. Arthur, M.A.; Chaplain to the *Hawke*.
Bonsey, Rev. W., M.A., Vicar of Northaw, Herts; Vicar of Lancaster.
Boscawen, Rev. A. T.; Rector of Ludgvan, Cornwall.
Bull, Rev. Benjamin; Rector of Binegar, Somersetshire.
Day, Rev. Maurice W., Senior Curate of Waterford Cathedral; Incumbent of St. John's, Newport, county Tipperary.
Evans, Rev. Reuben; Rector of Llandinabo, Herefordshire.
Gabell, Rev. Arthur Charles; Rector of Nunney, Frome.
Garnier, Rev. Canon T. O., M.A.; Examining Chaplain to the Bishop-designate of Norwich.
Gill, Rev. William, Rector of Elvetham; Vicar of Grosmont, Whitby.
Hackworth, Rev. T., B.A., Curate of St. Michael's, Workington; Rector of Watermillock, Penrith.
Hill, Rev. John C., M.A., Senior Curate of Rotherham; Rector of Halesowen, Birmingham.
Hobart-Hampden, Rev. Arthur Kennett, M.A.; Rector of Little Kimble, Bucks.
Jones, Rev. Richard, Incumbent of St. Anne's, Yorkshire; Vicar of Bedwelty, Cardiff.
Jones, Rev. Robert Landemann, B.A.; Chaplain to Shepton Mallet Prison.
Lindsay, Rev. John, B.A.; British Chaplain at Caen, Normandy.
Longrigg, Rev. J. W., M.A.; Chaplain to the *St. Vincent*.
Lutener, Rev. William Maurice Bonner, M.A., Vicar of St. Mark's, Dunham Massey; Vicar of St. George's, Altrincham.
Maitland, Rev. A. G., Vicar of Dudley; Surrogate for the Diocese of Worcester,
Nash, Rev. C. H., M.A., Curate of St. Matthew's, Croydon; Vicar of St. Mary's, Maidenhead.
Perowne, Ven. Archdeacon; Examining Chaplain to the Bishop-designate of Norwich.
Perry-Gore, Rev. G., Vicar of St. Mary's, Oldham; Surrogate for the Diocese of Manchester.
Pryke, Rev. William E., M.A., Head Master of Lancaster School; Chaplain to the High Sheriff of Lancashire (Sir Thomas Storey).
Pugh, Rev. G. A., Rector of Ashton-under-Lyne; Surrogate for the Diocese of Manchester.
Ram, Rev. Stephen Adye Scott, M.A.; Licensed Preacher in the Diocese of Manchester.
Roberts, Rev. Thomas, M.A.; Chaplain to the *Aurora*.
Ruck-Keene, Rev. Edmund Ralph, M.A., Vicar of St. John's, Withyam; Rector of Copford, Colchester.
Sharp, Rev. Mountague Richard, M.A., Curate of St. Margaret's, Durham; Curate of the Parish Church, Kidderminster, with Charge of the Ecclesiastical District of Franche.
Sisson, Rev. M. J., Chaplain at Ipswich Prison; Chaplain at Birmingham Prison.
Stoyle, Rev. W. Blin, B.A., Assistant-Curate of Alford; Curate-in-Charge of Mumby, Lincolnshire.
Thompson, Rev. Foster J., M.A.; Rector of Hannington.
Todd, Rev. Charles J., M.A.; Chaplain to the *Pembroke*.
Vickers, Rev. Valentine Shilleto; Rector of Crundale, Kent.
Ward, Rev. T. W., M.A., Perpetual Curate of Hatfield-heath, Harlow, Essex.
Watson, Rev. Howard Aylwin, B.A.; Rector of Boughton Malherbe, Kent.
Wethered, Rev. Edmund Peel, M.A.; Domestic Chaplain to the Bishop-designate of Norwich.
Woodward, Rev. G. J., B.D., B.C.L., Curate of Newburn; Vicar of Mickley, Northumberland.
Wright, Rev. George Howard, M.A.; Vicar of Chilham St. Mary, Canterbury.

CLERICAL OBITUARY.

Appleton, Rev. Arthur, Assistant Curate, at the Clergy House, St. George's, Camberwell, on the 13th inst., aged 33.
Blisset, Rev. Henry, M.A., at Letton Court, Hereford, on the 4th inst., aged 84.
Hoare, Rev. Francis, Vicar of Holy Trinity, Derby, at the Grand Hotel, Milan, on the 5th inst.
Hussey, Rev. William Law, M.A., of St. George's-place, Canterbury, formerly Rector of Ringstead, Norfolk, on the 13th inst., aged 79.
Thursby, Rev. William Ford, Rural Dean of Brooke W., twenty-nine years Rector of Bergh Apton, at Bergh Apton Rectory, on the 8th inst., aged 62.

FIRST REMOVE THE CAUSE.

MEN frequently worry and trouble themselves a great deal in trying to cure the symptoms of vital weakness' nervous exhaustion, and kindred ailments, instead of endeavouring to first remove the cause. This can be done by Mr. Harness' Electropathic Treatment without the aid of drugs. It is useless to tell sufferers to employ their minds and bodies in useful work and to forget their disorders, so long as the cause of their troubles is not removed. How can it be expected that when they are fatigued by the least exertion they can occupy themselves by studying, walking, or other exercise? Even in conversation they frequently lose the thread of it and repeatedly find their memory failing them. What can they do? Physic will not cure them—perhaps the leading physicians have failed to afford them any relief, and they have consequently become hopeless. It is to such as these that Mr. Harness' new combined Electropathic Belt and Suspensory is so strongly recommended, as, by its gentle but continuous action, invigorating electric currents are imperceptibly generated and conveyed direct from the spinal cord to the affected parts. It is this scientifically constructed and convenient appliance which silently but surely acts upon the vital organs, and removes the cause of the patient's disease, effecting a wonderful change in his health, character, and conduct, and speedily enabling him to return to his natural tastes and habits, and enjoy once more the full vigour of youth, with all its accompanying pleasures.

We may add that this perfect Electro-medical appliance is exceedingly comfortable to wear, gives wonderful support and vitality to all the internal organs of the body, prevents chills, imparts new life and vigour to the debilitated constitution, stimulates the organic action, promotes the circulation, assists digestion, and promptly renews that vital energy, the loss of which is the first symptom of decay. Its healing properties are multifarious. It stimulates the functions of various organs, increases their secretions, gives tone to muscle and nerves, relaxes morbid contractions, improves nutrition, and effectually renews exhausted nerve force. Acting directly on the system, it sustains and assists its various functions, and thus promotes the health and vigour of the entire frame. Besides these benefits, the mind is maintained in a buoyant, cheerful state, and every faculty is stimulated to the highest condition of intellectual strength.

Gentlemen who read the above announcement have only to visit London and call at the Electropathic and Zander Institute (52, Oxford Street, W.) to be convinced of the marvellous curative powers of Electricity and Mr. Harness' perfect methods of imperceptibly applying the current. The medical officers of the establishment are in daily attendance, and may be consulted free of charge either personally or by letter.

The Church of England Pulpit.

THE REFLEX EFFECT OF CHRISTIAN MISSIONS.

By the Rev. W. E. RAWSTORNE, Hon. Canon of Manchester.

Sermon Preached at Christ Church, Preston, for the Church Missionary Society, May 7th, 1893.

"When Jesus heard it, He marvelled, and said to them that followed, Verily I say unto you, I have not found so great faith, no, not in Israel. And I say unto you, that many shall come from the east and west, and shall sit down with Abraham, and Isaac, and Jacob, in the kingdom of heaven. But the children of the kingdom shall be cast out into outer darkness: there shall be weeping and gnashing of teeth."—Matt. viii. 10-12.

Ἀμὴν λέγω ὑμῖν, οὐδὲ ἐν τῷ Ἰσραὴλ τοσαύτην πίστιν εὗρον. λέγω δὲ ὑμῖν, ὅτι πολλοὶ ἀπὸ ἀνατολῶν καὶ δυσμῶν ἥξουσι, καὶ ἀνακλιθήσονται μετὰ Ἀβραὰμ καὶ Ἰσαὰκ καὶ Ἰακὼβ ἐν τῇ βασιλείᾳ τῶν οὐρανῶν· οἱ δὲ υἱοὶ τῆς βασιλείας ἐκβληθήσονται εἰς τὸ σκότος τὸ ἐξώτερον· ἐκεῖ ἔσται ὁ κλαυθμὸς καὶ ὁ βρυγμὸς τῶν ὀδόντων.

THESE words contain our Saviour's reflection upon a character which seemed to Him to deserve the highest praise. The man, who had earned for himself this unique distinction, was a military officer, holding the rank of captain, in the army of Herod Antipas, a subject king, like the protected native princes of our Indian empire, whose little army was organised on the Roman model, and officered with centurions, and other higher grades, like those of Rome.

He was not a son of Israel, nor educated in the worship of Jehovah, nor can we call him a fruit of those missionary efforts which were active among the Pharisees at that time. But he had lived in a country where the religion of the Old Testament had many adherents, and, like numbers of people in those days, had felt its superiority to all the other worships of the Syrian tribes, or of the great Roman empire. He had felt drawn to it by its pure and simple belief in one Holy, Almighty, All-providing, paternal God, and loved the nation that worshipped Him, and built them a house of prayer. Having thus felt his way to God and found Him, he had had formed in him, by God's grace, a character full of simple faith and obedience such as could hardly be found in Israel itself.

Thus our Lord holds him forth in the text as an example and a warning to those whose privilege it had been to be born and nurtured in Israel.

This leads us to reflect on one of the most wholesome lessons that we can learn from missionary enterprises and exertions of every kind, and that is the reflex effect that they ought to have upon those professedly Christian peoples by whom the missionaries are sent forth. This is the special lesson of the text. It tells us that many shall come from the East and from the West, and sit down, converted, sanctified, and purified in the kingdom of God. Missionary reports show us that such conversions are actually taking place. Then arises the serious thought, What is becoming of the children of the kingdom, *i.e.*, of ourselves? Are we advancing along that path of light which shineth ever more and more unto the perfect day? or are we declining towards that outer darkness, in which is nothing left but self-reproach and despair?

You will see, no doubt, that we have two views to take, and those exactly similar to those two which our Saviour took. For Him those views were of the Israelite and the non-Israelite world; for us they are of the Christian and of the non-Christian world. We have to take those two views, and to institute the same comparison that He did. Let that be our subject this evening.

What a wonderful sight, when we calmly look at it, is the non-Christian world! There are in it religions which, like Hinduism, were fully developed and organised, not merely hundreds, but thousands of years before Christ came into the world. And there are reformed communities, like the Buddhist, which represent a reaction (not unlike our Reformation) against the external ceremonial religion, and the idolatries of the older faith, which took place under the preaching of a great reformer 600 years before Christ was born, and which have since become, following apparently a natural law which governs the development of religion, as outward and as ceremonial, and almost as idolatrous, as those worships against which its Founder (like our own) protested. And there is Mohammedanism, younger than our own faith, which nevertheless represents a real reaction from that idolatry, into which all religions seem doomed from time to time to fall, to the one great primeval truth, There is no God, but God. And there are a vast number of barbarous idolatries or fetishisms, practised by savage tribes, which may be obscurations of a truth once given, or ineffectual attempts of childish minds to feel after a truth, which they have never yet been able to grasp.

It is into a world thus various that the missionaries of Christ go forth. And their success or failure is found to be exactly in inverse proportion to the strength of the religions which they attack. Where those religions are very strong, either through the possession of some one isolated truth, or through ancient authority, or through strong organisation, they gain few converts. In India, for example, Christian missionaries are found to wage an unequal warfare against the religion of Hinduism, which is very strong, notwithstanding all its

gross idolatries and superstitions and immoralities, through its vast antiquity, and through the hold that it has thereby gained on all the ideas and habits of the people, and through the system of caste, which is an almost invincible barrier against all change. In the Buddhist countries, the great obstacle to Christianity is the pure morality which that wonderful religion once practised, and still professes, in the midst of its entire disbelief in God, and its hopeless prospect beyond the grave. The Mohammedans are steeled against the faith of Christ by the one great truth, which is the first of the two articles which form their simple creed—there is no God but God—an article identical with that which Moses taught to Israel, and which Jesus Christ approved—Hear, O Israel, Jehovah our God is one Jehovah. In China the chief impediment is the intense conservatism of that wonderful people, for whom God's first commandment with promise—deference to parents and to antiquity before them—has always been the guiding principle of practical life, and has received, in a most wonderful way, its promised reward. That principle (deeply true in itself) has made that nation so durable, that it alone, among the contemporaries of the Pharaohs of Egypt and the Assyrians of Nineveh and Babylon, is still alive and flourishing, and still possesses a future before it greater and longer than that of any of the ephemeral States or nations in which we ourselves are interested, which think much of an antiquity of 1,300 years.

Against these strong and ancient religions our religion struggles hard, but not as yet with any great success.

But the case is different when Christianity goes among the coarser and more ignorant tribes, whose religion consists of a few vague ideas about unseen supernatural powers, or, where those unseen powers are supposed to be evil and cruel beings, who must be bribed by offerings to abstain from doing harm to their worshippers. When it preaches to the aboriginal tribes of India, or to African savages, or to the islanders of the Pacific Ocean, a religion of perfect love—a God who is love, a God-man who is love incarnate—and a law of love to regulate all man's conduct to his brother man, it finds no strong antagonist faith to contend with, and nothing to unteach and overcome except vice and the ignorance which is the cause of vice.

It is this latter class of peoples amongst whom our religion proves its power to convert and elevate humanity. They are its chief present field, and when it has won them to the obedience of its Master, it may advance, multiplied and strengthened to its final conflict with the other great religions, which still dispute with it its claim to be the one religion of the world.

In some of the countries which have inherited an ancient civilisation that conflict seems to have begun already. Such is notably the case in Japan. There you find a nation laying aside all its ancestral ideas, political and religious, eagerly welcoming in their stead the science, and the civilisation, and the institutions of the west, and thus presenting a free field to the diffusion of Christian doctrine. It is the first of the old cultivated nations which seems ready to accept Christ as its Teacher, but we may be very sure that the others will follow in their turn.

If we are ever inclined to be discouraged by the moderate success which Christian missions have yet had, we should reflect how new they are.

So far as our country is concerned, the missionary spirit, and the efforts to spread the Gospel in the world, are all contained within the limits of our present expiring century. The Church Missionary Society, and the Nonconformist missionary societies which work with it in friendly and brotherly rivalry, have none of them quite reached their hundredth year. The Society for the Propagation of the Gospel, and that for Promoting Christian Knowledge, are each of them a hundred years older. But except the Moravians, who have a good right to the premier rank among Protestant missions, the efforts made, outside of the Church of Rome, to convert the heathen, were, until the beginning of the present century, only slight and few. Thus, as was said, almost the whole of our missionary successes thus far gained lie within the compass of the last hundred years. Considering the time employed in the work, the achievements have been very great. In India there are native Christian communities which have struck deep root and are living an in-independent life of their own. It is true that these were chiefly gathered from those tribes which either had no religion of their own, worthy of the name, or were worshippers of the power of evil. But a body of people thus raised out of hopeless degradation is a grand trophy of Christ, and has an ever-increasing influence on those surrounding classes who see these, who were once outcasts, raised to their level and above themselves. The isles of the Pacific Ocean are almost entirely Christianised, especially Fiji, which has been won for Christ by the Wesleyan missionaries. New Zealand was once as decidedly converted by the Church Missionary Society; and it is the fault of professedly Christian settlers that that good work has been disturbed, and many of the once promising converts seduced away to a new superstition. There are Christian native communities on every side, and even in the centre, of darkest Africa; and we have all heard, in the story of Uganda, that many of these are not only eager for Christian knowledge, and purified in life, but even strong enough for martyrdom. Almost every other heathen country sends home similar intelligence. In every one there is a beginning, and in most Christianity has become indigenous, and is growing from a root of its own.

It is not to be denied that this native Christianity is in many cases very weak, or that much of the old

leaven of heathenry continues in those who have accepted Christ. It was so even in apostolic times, and it is so now. We hear from time to time, for example, of that sensuality, which is in the blood of the African tribes especially, breaking out with tremendous force among the new converts on the Niger, and even in the partially civilised congregations of Sierra Leone. Such reversions of past evils are inevitable. Have Christian Englishmen freed themselves from all those vices which prevailed among their Anglo-Saxon forefathers 1,300 years ago before Christ's name was known among them? Have we yet embraced in their fulness the principles of Christ? or can we yet call ourselves a Kingdom of God and heaven upon earth?

This reflection leads us to our second point of view—to look at home; as Christ found fault with His Israel, so to find fault with our Christendom, our Christianity. There is no doubt that the great bar to the progress of Christ's kingdom upon earth is the vices and the evil-doing of professedly Christian people. The missionary teachers and the mercenary traders, each alike sent out by Christian nations, find themselves in direct antagonism to each other among the heathen tribes. The missionaries take out their Bibles and other books to convert the people from wickedness and violence. The traders take out their guns, with which the savage tribes may kill one another, and their alcoholic liquors, with which they may destroy themselves, so that the two are in direct conflict on the missionary field itself.

And when any native Christian comes to visit our country, he finds it but half, or not quite half, Christianised. He looks in vain for that Kingdom of God which is the prevalence, in men's hearts and lives, of love towards God and love towards man; of righteousness, and peace, and joy; of all the works of the spirit over all the works of the flesh. He finds that Christ, with His noble principles of pure and unselfish life, is not acknowledged as the reigning King among those who profess His name; and so he goes back to his own countrymen deeply discouraged, and with his illusions about the practical good of Christianity faded away.

It is thus that the un-Christian state of Christian nations hinders the progress of Christianity in the world. We cannot dwell upon this point of view too often or too long. So let us seriously consider the state of things at home.

In religion we have Christianity almost universally professed. But everywhere we see a tendency to prefer the form over the substance. We can be very zealous for the outward Church or sect to which we may be attached, which, with its particular mode of organisation, its order of ceremonial, its outward religious practices, is but the form. But can we say that we are equally zealous for those weightier matters of the law towards which the Lord strove to direct His disciples' minds—for truth, for love, for righteousness, for purity, for peace, for every kind of unselfish beneficence, which is the substance? Do we confine our feelings of Christian brotherhood to those who hold the same outward form as we? or do we extend those feelings freely and fully to all those who, by the Christianity of their lives and hearts, prove, by the only proof which our Master recognised, that they have the true spirit of Christ in them? The trophies of the mission-field, which are divided very equally amongst different Christian bodies, should teach us by that plainest proof that we are all working in one cause, serving one Master, partakers of one Spirit, and bound to recognise each other here at home, as well as there abroad; and here as there to work together in that free co-operation which is a far better and truer unity than that of external organisation, which always has been, and always will be, so long as men are what they are, apt to become an instrument of tyranny and slavery. The intelligence that comes to us day by day from the mission-field calls on us to root all sectarianism out of our religion, and to cultivate friendly relations with all those who name the Name of Christ.

Nor, while we confess and strive to amend the faults which degrade the religion of the day, need we shrink from giving one passing glance to the evils which infect the politics of our time—the mean and selfish, and, because selfish, therefore blind party spirit, in which men sacrifice all to the success of their party, and even to a still baser object, their own personal careers; in which they ever neglect the weak, and flatter and yield to the strong. Never was there a time when, in public life, egotism was so idolised, and never a time when men were so much needed who would apply themselves to all the great questions of State in a true Christ-like spirit, seeking nothing for themselves, but all for the good of others, that they may be happy and safe. In a moment of supreme national danger, like that in which we now stand, all of us need to be admonished to rise above party spirit, and above the idolatry of men, and to practise ourselves, and demand of all our would-be leaders, obedience to the principles of Christ—simple truthfulness and perfect unselfishness—as the only service which God accepts, and the only one that can be an example to the world.

More important still are those social questions to which the principles of Christ have their most immediate application—questions relating to material well-being, to the means of enjoyment of life, and of physical and mental improvement for those classes whose present share in the good things of this life is smallest. Of all bad examples that can be presented by Christian nations to the heathen world, none is worse than the spectacle of general selfishness, which is now so flagrant, so shameless, of classes and sections, engaging in mutual conflict, instead of closing their differences by mutual concession or friendly arbitration. These dreadful

conflicts, in which the means of subsistence are not increased, but destroyed and devoured, could all be terminated in a moment by the application of one principle of Christ—"Let no man seek his own, but every man another's wealth." But the great principle is not applied and acted upon as it ought to be.

And if we look still deeper into the moral state of professed Christian nations, is it wonderful that they are found powerless to win the world to Christ? Consider the drunkenness and the vice so frequent among all classes, the selfish luxury among those who have been most liberally supplied with the good things of this life, and who ought to set the best examples. Where are the good works which men should behold, and glorify our heavenly Father and the Christ whom we recommend? Where is the light that ought to be enlightening the world?

But we must not paint the evils of our times in too dark colours. Those who have reached the time of life when they can say that they have been familiarly acquainted with three generations of men and women, can also say, as the fruit of their long experience, that, though they have seen some evils increased, yet they have seen more diminished, and many fresh good things appear.

Amidst all these disheartening symptoms there is one encouraging one which opens before us the brightest prospect for the future. This is the rapid increase amongst us of true Christian philanthropy, confined to no Church or sect, but asserting itself widely on every side. Never was there a time when so many were studying and labouring to help the weak, to raise the fallen, to tend the sick, to make life happier and better for those whose outward means of happiness and well-being are scantiest and fewest. Never was the truth more widely acknowledged, that we are all our brother's keepers, and that we cannot leave them alone in vice or in wretchedness. Never were truly charitable works more abundant than now.

Yet all such works are only as yet beginnings and are capable of infinite expansion. They must be persevered in, with increasing wisdom and increasing self-denial, until our professedly Christian nation becomes Christian in deed and in truth, and happy in its Christianity. Then it will by its own intrinsic strength convert the heathen nations by which it is surrounded.

Here, then, at home is our chief work, our real mission—to make this professedly Christian nation so truly Christian that, by the action of its own intrinsic force, it may spread its own Christianity over the non-Christian world.

In that work let everyone amongst us claim his share. We should not be content with merely giving money, but give personal work as well. There is ample room for everyone to help in raising the lapsed, in supporting the weak, in relieving the distressed, in bringing home the lost sheep. There is room everywhere for personal effort, and there are charitable organisations in which every one, whatever his tastes or convictions, may find a field for labour.

Yet, though our chief work must ever be the work at home, we must not turn our eyes away from that abroad. The foreign work and the home work do not hinder, but help each other, and may go on hand in hand.

Give liberally to the foreign work. Never think that the money is wasted that is sent abroad, because there is so much that needs doing at home. Each liberal gift begets a family of other such-like gifts by the influence that it exerts on other hearts and minds. And if our country ever becomes really Christianised, there will be no lack of money for every philanthropic enterprise. We are rich enough to maintain them all, home and foreign, if we had the will. Is it not true that the money raised for all charitable works of every kind, is only a very small fraction of that lavished every year, by all classes of Englishmen, upon the one self-indulgence of drink? We can all spend money on that which does no one any good and which does most people a good deal of harm. Every penny that is rescued from selfishness, whether sent abroad or applied at home, is something saved from misuse and given to God.

Nor must we think that the men and women, who are sent abroad, and who are amongst the best and bravest sons and daughters of our country, are wasted for us because they live and die in foreign lands. They are not lost, for their example acts on us while living, and when they are dead it still speaks. What has made the names of Livingstone, and Mackay, and Brooke, and Mackenzie, and Pattison, and Hannington, household words, but that isolated position in foreign lands, which exhibited them as a spectacle to all, when they jeopardised and laid down their lives?

And if any of us are among those who have any share in modelling society, whether in Church or in State, in both of those departments there is infinite need for introducing more of the principles and rules of Christ.

In the Church we have to promote Christian union—not that of external organisation, not that of rules of diet concerning meat and drink, not that of a round of ceremonial worship, not that of a calendar of days of observance, but that of a Christ-like spirit, confessing oneness with all who are like-minded with Him.

In the social world we have to learn the hard lesson of seeking not our own, either for our own personal self, or for the class, or rank, or party to which we belong.

And if, in our humble sphere, we follow out these aims, the Christian spirit, so evoked and fostered, may work upwards to the higher department of the State and correct the egotism and party spirit and untruthfulness which seems sometimes to dominate everything there.

So may we promote the great work of extending Christ's kingdom in the world. When the nations, who now call themselves Christian, become truly kingdoms of the Lord and of His Christ, then will they, by their own intrinsic strength, Christianise the whole heathen world.

One word in conclusion about the special work of the Church Missionary Society.

Amongst those engaged in evangelising the world it holds a very high, perhaps the highest place. I have had many opportunities to watch the action of the committee that governs its operations, and I can say from personal knowledge that its tone is very high, its motives pure, its spirit tolerant, charitable, and cordial to all those who work in the same great field. It well deserves the success which God is giving in ever-increasing measure to its efforts, and it deserves the support that I have no doubt you are giving liberally to it to-day.

Its leading men give freely of their money, their time, and their labour. Many of its missionaries make a free will offering of their lives. Your part is to fulfil to them our Saviour's prophecy and promise. Since they give, it is your part to give to them. Good measure, pressed down, and shaken together, and running over, do you pour into their bosom.

CHRIST'S LOVE AS A MOTIVE.

By the Rev. ROBERT EYTON, M.A., Rector of Holy Trinity, Upper Chelsea, and Prebendary of St. Paul's Cathedral.

Sermon Preached in Substance in Holy Trinity Church, on the Eve of St. Paul's Conversion.

"For the love of Christ constraineth us."—2 Cor. v. 14.

IN these words St. Paul lets us into the secret of his life. Before his conversion and after his conversion St. Paul seems, when we think of him, to be such a different man that we want some sort of account of so great a change. Just think of the contrast for a minute. Before his conversion he was a man full of energy, full of sincerity; but he was narrow, he was prejudiced, he was a bigot. The one employment of his life was the persecution of other people for the opinions which they held and for the way that they acted upon them. The one object of his life was to exterminate what he regarded as an infatuated sect, a sect that had gathered round the name of One whom he regarded as a dead man, the Lord Jesus Christ. And bigots, you know, not only then, but now, often put other people to shame by the untiring energy of their efforts. The difficulty is very often to get people who have wider and larger views to be sufficiently in earnest about anything to effect much; but all the most bigoted men, in Church matters, in politics, or as regards any public question—the most bigoted men, you will generally find, are the most active men. I do not think that they are any the less mischievous for that, but there is the fact. Unquestionably bigots often put to shame those who have more enlightened views by their superior activity. They are untiring in their efforts; they leave no stone unturned to achieve their ends; they keep one thing always in view; and whatever they are, and whatever they do, that one thing—be it the prevailing of their own particular form of religion or be it the prevailing of their own particular conception of the welfare of the nation, or whatever it be—in season and out of season they are instant about it, and they bring into it every single thing that they do and talk about and every single cause which they lend their support to; their one aim is to advance that upon which their heart is set. If only, dear people, we could arrive at the same earnestness in our more enlightened fashion and with our more enlightened methods as was shown by the bigots of the Inquisition, for instance; if only we were as much affected with zeal as they were in the days when, as it has been said, they burned men's bodies for the good of their souls; if only we were as much affected about good causes and about helping men's bodies as well as their souls as they were in those days, the world would be a great deal better place to live in than it actually is. For bigots—mind this—may be distinguished very broadly from the great mass of indifferent and aqueous pietists—they may be distinguished from them in this way: that bigots are men who know what they want, and will do anything in the world, lawful and sometimes unlawful, to gain what they want. Now in that respect we none of us desire to follow them, I hope; but in respect to their earnestness, in respect to the way in which they keep the main thing which they desire straight in front of them always, most of us who profess more enlightened opinions have a great deal to learn from them—concentration of purpose, energy in carrying out the purpose when we have once conceived it. Those are valuable things; those are things which do really effect great changes in the world; and it is a pity that so often those high qualities should seem to be the peculiar property of bigots.

Well, and then come back to St. Paul. He was a bigot before his conversion, and he was a religious bigot. And there was that curious thing about him that you see about religious bigots in these days; he was very hard-hearted. There is nothing in religion, nothing even in the Christian religion as we profess it now, that seems to protect a bigoted man against hardness of heart. At this present day men who are bigoted in their own conception of Divine truth will do the most cruel things and say the hardest things about those who differ from them. Nothing seems to move them; no considerations of pity or tenderness seem to have

any effect upon them. So it was with Paul. You would think that the purity and the youth and the holiness of St. Stephen would have touched him, but they had exactly the effect which purity and tenderness seem to have upon bigoted natures: they added fuel to his indignation. The name of Christ was an abomination to him, a thing to spit upon. The followers of Christ were in his eyes men outside the pale of human sympathy. They deserved nothing but to be harried, and worried, and persecuted, and killed, and swept off the face of the earth.

Now look at the same man twenty years after, and you will find in him still that quality, the absence of which we have often to lament in people of enlightened opinions. You will find the same energy, the same zeal, the same concentration of purpose, in him; you will find all just as before, and you will find in him other qualities that you did not find before, a deep humility, a humility that is always breaking out. The most touching thing, I always think, about St. Paul is the way that, even in his greatest bursts of eloquence in his Epistles, he never seems to be able to forget that it had been he who persecuted the Church of God; that it had been he who had breathed out threatenings and slaughters, who had harried and devastated the fold of Christ. There came into him a deep humility. You see the same zeal and the same energy, aye, almost the same recklessness, that there was about him before. But now he thinks exactly the opposite of what he thought before. He is the same man, and yet he is such a different man. What is it that has come into him that has made this tremendous difference? What is it that has come into him that makes him so gentle where he used to be so hard, so forbearing where he used to be so impatient, so tender and kind where he used to seem so hard-hearted and cruel?

We get his own account of it in these few words: the love of Christ constrained, took him up, as it were embraced him, restrained him, kept him in his grasp. The love of Christ gripped him. He was His captive. He could know nothing else from henceforth but how to make himself the champion of Christ's work. The love of Christ gripped him. He who had hated Him, he who had execrated Him, he who had spat at the name of Christ, he who had hated it with a hatred that only intense natures like his are capable of—with no common hatred, no puny, mean, miserable jealousy or envy, but with a hatred which only intense natures are capable of feeling—he now can do all things, he says, but only through Christ Who strengtheneth him. He against Whom he had done the most powerful things in his life, he now confesses to be the Author of his new being. "In Christ Jesus," he cries out, "there is a new creation. Old things are passed away; all things are become new." Was it not so in his case? The old things, the old bigotry, the old hardness, the old cruelty, have passed away; all things are become new. All things around him and within him change; all things in heaven and earth look different from what they were before, all his thoughts, all his aspirations, all his associations, aye—we come to it at last—all his motives, are different. He was like a watch with a new mainspring, with a new kind of mainspring, and all the machinery had to be altered to adjust itself to the new mainspring. There was a new mainspring in his life, and he lets us into the secret of it: "The love of Christ constraineth us"—holds us in its grip.

And the mean of this change was through change of motive. Before he had been influenced, as bigoted people always are influenced, by motives like these: self-assertion, self-indulgence. Before he had been led by party spirit; he had been the slave of the mere names of things; he had been stimulated by self-seeking; he had been held back by shame; he had been pushed forward by fear; he had been moved by patriotism, by enthusiasm for religion not according to knowledge. Now all these lower motives, into which self enters so largely—all these lower motives were neutralised, were crushed out, were transformed, were almost glorified in one transcending thought, the overwhelming love of Christ. The love of Christ held him in its grip, and all these motives had faded away like the dew before the morning sun.

Brethren, it was a wonderful Conversion, as we call it in the collect for the festival; it was a wonderful Conversion. And, mark you, the account of it is the most simple thing in the world. The account of it is something which, if people will just but look at it and think of it, is before our eyes every day: the love of Christ. And by that he means here, not the love which he felt for Christ, but the love which Christ felt for him, not his own affection, not his own devotion—those were only secondary; those did not hold him in a grip, but the source of love, Christ Himself, the love which Christ felt for him, held him in its grip. The love of Christ for him, aye, for him, for others, for the world steeped in ignorance and misery—that was the bond of his captivity; that was the thing now which directed all his energies; that was that to which his life now became the response; that was, so to speak, the secret that explained everything, why he could not have a home, why he must be in perils of waters, in perils of robbers, in perils of his own countrymen, in weariness often, in deaths often. There is the secret of it all. He must be like that. The love of Christ held him in its grip, and sent him anywhere and everywhere, if by going there he could hope to bring men to Him.

And so love in him reached its perfect fulfilment, that perfect fulfilment of communion, Christ in him and he in Christ. It was no more he—he tells us that—it was Christ in him. It startled within himself all that wonderful sense of the in-

corporation of himself with Christ, which now is the highest blessedness of this world. It was no more he, but Christ that dwelt in him; Christ who, so to speak, haunted him; Christ whose cross, so to speak, was never absent from his life or from his mind for a minute; the thought of which occupied the background, so that he had only but just to turn round, and there was the thought of Christ and, as it were, the sight of Christ. Others might forget the event; but the very energy, the very earnestness, the very intensity, with which he had persecuted the name of Christ, makes it impossible for him ever again to forget Him whose love had come to be the one great motive power, the one great mainspring, of his life. What had Christ been to him—he who counted himself, in no forced language of fictitious humility. the chief of sinners? What had Christ been to him? He had sought him out; He had rebuked him; in a vision from heaven He had drawn him to Himself; He had caressed him, as it were; He had held him up; He had gripped him; He had fettered him; He had made him, as it were, His willing slave, His more than captive.

And it always seems to me that the conversion of St. Paul, if people will think about it, is the very highest evidence that can be found for the truth of the Christian religion. Moreover, it is one of those experiences which, though they seem to be unique, are really repeated in every single soul that turns away from sin to God. All of us, brethren, when we sin, do what Paul did before his conversion. We do not kill people for their opinions nowadays, but every time we hate others for what they think or for their real or imaginary injuries towards us Christ calls to us from heaven, though we hear Him not, "Why persecutest thou Me?" There is in us the same stubbornness, the same hardness, in essence there is the same attitude, as there was in Paul before his conversion. His love of Christ, or rather the love of Christ which laid hold of him, made him a different man.

And so it should be with you and me. The great, the supreme, question of our lives is, How are we treating the love of Christ? Whether you forget it or whether you remember it, whether you answer it or whether you ignore it, Christ still loves to the uttermost every single one of us. But is the love of Christ the constraining motive of our life? Has it got you in its grip, my brother? Does it urge you on to what you ought to do? Does it keep you back from what you know you ought not to do? Is it the impulse that makes you give yourself and, as a sign of yourself, give whatever you can to God? Is the love of Christ the consideration which enters into all your service? When you go to work to-morrow, is it the mainspring in the watch? Is it the motive at the root of your life? Because if it is, however deficient you may be, however short you may fall, all is well with you. But if you only think of it now and then, or if you never let it have a chance with you, if when it calls from heaven to you, as it does call now sometimes, all is not well with you. When you have been cruel, when you have been angry, when you have been jealous, when you have been hard upon other people, you feel an uncomfortable sense within you, then there is the voice calling you from heaven, "Why persecutest thou Me?" If you will think of it, if you will pray that you may hear it, that voice of Christ will be as clear to you as it was to St. Paul. His love will take you; it will grip you; it will drive you to what you ought to do; it will restrain you from what you ought not to do; it will become the guiding motive, it will become the mainspring of your life.

And one word more. What determines character? Remember always that it is not what you do that determines what you are, because you may do things, and you may do the very best things in the world—and some do them—really only as a sort of commercial undertaking, hoping to get something back for doing them: the praise of men, or even the approbation of your own conscience, or popularity. How many men there are who do, if they would only look at themselves, all sorts of good things, not because they are good, but in order that they may get a name for being good in those ways. If they would only look at themselves and think it out, there really is a sort of barter, a sort of commerce, about the good things they do.

No, character does not necessarily grow by good deeds. It may, of course, if they are done for good reasons, but it may not, and character may worsen through deeds that outwardly look good. There is only one way in which character grows. Character in you and me, in every man and woman, is determined by motive. Remember that always. A good tree must bring forth good fruit. So you, if your motives are good, if you try to act from some great, high-strung, constraining motive like the love of Christ, if you try to get a few motives, the best you can get—the love of Christ, the sense of indwelling of the Holy Ghost, the love of the Father, the welfare of mankind—a few strong motives that you can easily turn round and look at when you are busy, and act upon, you, too, will grow. These are the things which determine character; these are the things which make the fruit good, because these are the things which make the tree good, and therefore the fruit must be good.

And of all motives remember this is the purest: the love which Christ feels for us. There comes with it as it comes to us something more than words can express—much of gratitude, much of loyalty, much of personal affection. And it all comes through dwelling on that perfect ideal which was before the Apostle whose feast we are keeping to-night. To him, as he says, "to live is Christ," for Christ was ever with him, and by him, and over him, aye, and underneath him, for it was through Christ alone that he bore the hard

peril and the many disappointments of his long and weary ministry, and it was through Christ alone that he overcame death and has entered into life everlasting.

NOTICES.

All communications respecting the Literary portion of the paper should be addressed to the Editor.

Business communications of every kind should be addressed to Dr. S. Gibbon, at the Church of England Pulpit Office, 160, Fleet Street, London, E.C., to whom cheques and Post-office orders for subscriptions (in advance), three months, 2s., six months, 3s. 6d., twelve months, 6s. 6d., are to be made payable.

The Cases for binding Vol. XXXIV. are now ready.

For Health and Immortality.

The Ecclesiastical Review.

SATURDAY, MAY 27, 1893.

DISENDOWMENT A NATIONAL LOSS.

THE speech of the Bishop of Manchester at the Albert Hall Demonstration we take this opportunity of publishing verbatim, reserving for another occasion comment on the lines of argument pursued by other teachers. It may be remembered that the Bishop of Manchester has made this argument his own. No doubt plunder, pure and simple, furnishes a good deal of the motive for disendowment. But it is the case that there will be no "swag" for the political burglars who accomplish the job. Most of the money will be muddled away like the Irish Church surplus, the rest will only stimulate extravagance. It is absolutely certain that whatever happens disendowment will not lighten by one iota either rates or taxes, while the increased needs of the Church will have to be met out of the private gifts which at present go to other objects. Disendowment, viewed in all its aspects, must result in loss, not gain, to the nation.

At this late hour I must be short and must give you my reason for dissenting from the disestablishment and disendowment of the Church in Wales rather in the form of suggested than of developed argument. Well then, first, I think, it is bad economy to take away money which has been given for the furtherance of the Kingdom of God and apply it to meaner objects—(cheers)—such as the relief of distress, or even the curing of sick bodies, or the teaching of ignorant souls. Is it to be supposed that the majority of Englishmen have come to regard these as not meaner objects, that is to say, that they have come to regard the Christian religion as being a fraud or an illusion, and that, therefore, it will be better, more for the public weal, to found lunatic asylums, or to give out pensions to the aged, than to try to make all our people like the Lord Jesus Christ in life and character? (Cheers.) I know that there are some people who think so, but I am quite certain the number is diminishing, and that they are uttering their sentiments with failing courage and with sinking enthusiasm. Science and criticism have done their work, and the result is not to increase scepticism, but to rationalise and deepen faith. I believe that the great mass of Englishmen to-day think that there is nothing so necessary for the public welfare as the spread of Christian truth and principle. Why, then, I ask, are those to be deprived of their means of maintenance who are giving their whole life and energy with such signal success to the achievement of these highest purposes? Is it because others who share their work desire also to share their inheritance? Emphatically, No! They have repudiated any such purpose, declaring that they will take no part of the Church's property even if it were offered to them. Well, then, is it because the people of England are dissatisfied with the manner in which the Church is doing her work? Again, emphatically, No! (Cheers.) I believe that if the people of England could be asked the question, Will you take as your teacher in Christianity the National Church, or any other religious body in the land, the *plébiscite* would give an overwhelming majority in favour of the National Church. (Cheers.) What, then, are the arguments by means of which these modern spoilers would fain persuade us to partake in the wicked, sinful waste of which I have spoken? If one may judge from the debate on the Welsh Suspensory Bill they are these two: First, the argument of Mr. Asquith, that the Church ought to be despoiled in order that Dissenters might compete with her on more equal terms. (Laughter.) Secondly, the argument of the Prime Minister himself, that the Church ought to be despoiled because the majority of the Welsh people, through their members, demand that it shall be. ("Shame.") Now, if these reasons be good for anything, they ought to apply to all cases that are really similar. Will they bear such application? If there be two bodies of men competing for a common object, I ask you, is it generally right to rob the richer in order to make competition easier for the poorer? (Laughter and cheers.) It has been said that the landowners of England are competing for political power with other classes of the population. Is it right, then, to rob the landowners in order that the other classes may have an easier task? It has been said again that the largest capitalists are competing with smaller capitalists for the control of trade. Is it right then, I ask once more, to rob the large capitalists in order to favour the poor ones? If these arguments were worth anything, they would bear application to cases like those. But, my friends, let us take the second argument—that of Mr. Gladstone—and see what it is worth. He said, "It is right to despoil the Church, not because it is excessively endowed in Wales, nor because it is lax in its work, but simply because the Welsh people, through their members, ask it." Well, I refuse to admit what I call the ridiculous claim of Wales to be a distinct nation. (Cheers.) I refuse to admit, and I believe all patriotic Welshmen would agree with me, that Welshmen ought to be treated, in either civil or ecclesiastical matters, apart from their fellow-countrymen. (Cheers.) But suppose that the majority, even of the English people, demand that the Church should be spoiled for no reason but because they demanded it, should we therefore rightly submit without a struggle? Is popular opinion always right? Can we always trust it to keep us clear of national danger and disaster? Assuredly not. Many a time have we to appeal from Philip drunk to Philip sober, from popular opinion temporarily misled to popular opinion moralised and instructed. (Cheers.) We ask our fellow-countrymen in Wales to bear such an appeal being made to them now, for we believe they have been grievously misled by unscrupulous misrepresentations and fierce denunciations. (Cheers.) As for ourselves, my lord Archbishop, our course is clear. We are going to oppose this Bill by every means in

our power. (Loud cheers.) How can we stand idly by and see the Church plundered by unbelief or sectarian jealousy, or, worst of all, see it fatally wounded to supply an eminent and aged Statesman with twenty-eight Welsh votes for an alien political purpose? (Loud cheers.) I believe that the eyes of Englishmen are being rapidly opened to the real character of this unscrupulous measure, and that they see in it the beginning of religious ruin and national dissolution. They have lifted up the voice of indignant protest again and again. Enthusiastic meetings are being held in all parts of the land against this measure, petitions are pouring in by the thousand, this great meeting has lifted up its voice to-day in thunder tones against the attempted sacrilege. (Loud cheers.) And, ladies and gentlemen, if I am not grievously mistaken, the time is not distant when all the defences of our enemies will fall down flat, as fell of old the great wall of Jericho at the sounding of the trumpets of Israel. (Loud cheers.)

CORRESPONDENCE.

To the Editor of the CHURCH OF ENGLAND PULPIT AND ECCLESIASTICAL REVIEW.

THE RELIGIOUS QUESTION BEFORE THE LONDON SCHOOL BOARD.

SIR,—Canon Melville's consistent advocacy through many years—from a date indeed, if I mistake not, long anterior to Mr. Forster's introduction of his Education Bill—of a basis of religious teaching represented by the Creed, the Lord's Prayer, and the Ten Commandments, interpreted as they have been generally understood in this country both by Churchmen and Dissenters, can surely deserve nothing but respect and admiration; nor can I at all agree with Mr. Coxhead's remarks upon the legislation of 1870. The Act of that year was directed against *all* formularies distinctive of particular denominations, and, although the Catechism of the Church of England may have been chiefly in view of its framers, it imposed no stricter veto upon that formulary than upon those of other religious bodies.

It should, however, be always carefully remembered that the prohibition of distinctive formularies is imposed upon board schools not simply as being held in premises which are the *property* of a school board, but as schools actually "provided" by the board, and conducted under its "control and management." In this respect the Bishop of Salisbury's Bill introduces no change, and ought therefore, I think, to have been introduced as a declaratory rather than as an enacting measure. In the course of the debate Lord Norton mentioned that the Birmingham Board itself takes this view of the clause (as indeed, I believe, it always has done), and permits religious instruction to be given in its own buildings by the clergy for half an hour on two days in each week; and this (as I understand him to mean) without any restriction as to not using formularies.

But the Bishop of Salisbury's Bill is, of course, an enacting one in this sense, that it gives to parents as a *right*, and without pecuniary charge, what the clergy and others have hitherto had to ask as a *favour*, and (at Birmingham, at all events) to pay for into the bargain. Canon Melville is hardly justified in describing a Bill which confers so invaluable a religious privilege, and which, moreover, enables the members of the school staff to take part in the instruction referred to, as a "little" Bill.

If I am right in thinking that the Bill merely gives the parents power to demand what the school board has already the power to concede, then (whether the change be big or little) it would seem that the objection to Dr. Martineau's suggestions (now apparently accepted by Mr. Athelstan Riley) must disappear. For those suggestions are substantially embodied in the Bishop's plan, which is one (if the above arguments are sound and indisputable) that can be legally acted upon at once by any board inclined to adopt it; and therefore it cannot be correct to urge that "no radical change in the system of the London School Board could be introduced without legislation."

Canon Melville says (as I read his letter) that the resolution of the first London School Board was generally understood to go no further than "the Bible read and the principles of morality taught." Yet the resolution speaks not only of *reading* the Bible, but of giving "such explanations and such instruction *therefrom* in the principles of morality *and religion* as are suitable to the capacities of children;" and it is one thing to endeavour "to attach children to any particular denomination" (which the resolution forbids), and quite another to teach doctrines on which the great body of Christians, not of one, two, or three, but of almost all denominations are agreed. Nevertheless, Mr. Athelstan Riley's original proposal *does* make a change, and one which, as many persons will probably be of opinion, is really far more serious, and far more calculated to provoke opposition, than the plan preferred by Dr. Martineau and by the Bishop of Salisbury; for it uses the authority of the board to enforce the teaching of doctrines which, under the existing resolution, may be inculcated, or denied, or passed over, at the discretion of the responsible teachers of each school.

To me it certainly seems that the old London "compromise" (expressed in the old resolution) was the natural and fair embodiment of the principle underlying the Cowper-Temple Clause, and that in a large area like the metropolis anything more definite than this must be necessarily left, if not to the individual teachers, at all events to the local managers. But, further, the Marquis of Salisbury spoke the plain and simple truth when he said that the clause had been an "absolute failure." So, and for the same reasons, has been the "compromise." I do not mean that they have been failures always and everywhere, but where they have not been so it has been simply because religious differences have been temporarily dormant. I am sure that many of those who were parties to the "clause" (or to its offspring the "compromise") must have felt this all along, and have regarded the whole system as merely provisional, only intended to last until the Church had taken the necessary steps for resuming, in the case of her own children, an office which legitimately and properly belonged to herself alone, and not to a board chosen by men of all religions and of none.

Well the time has come at last for something more definite. So far we are all agreed. Does the original plan of Mr. Athelstan Riley meet the case? Is it not just as certain to break down as was its predecessor, the "compromise"? I would look at it first of all religiously. Canon Melville speaks of "milk," by which I suppose he means the truths of the Apostles' Creed; and he contrasts this milk with "strong meat," which is to follow "under pastoral provision" But ought not the "newborn babes'

to receive the "sincere milk of the word" from the tender breast of their mother the Church? Can we be content to give them that milk by the hand of strangers? Why is "pastoral provision" to be held necessary for those who can profit by "strong meat," while the babes and sucklings have to be content with the *iniusta noverca* of a school board—a board on which Agnostics may sit? Can the battle of the faith be fought amid the din of an election contest, the result of which may depend after all upon the difference between a ninepenny and a tenpenny rate? Canon Melville says, indeed, that he hopes many Church teachers, coming from Church training colleges, will now feel at liberty to adopt the "baptismal covenant" as the basis of their instruction. May they then tell their pupils that some of them, being baptised, are already within that covenant, and that others, being unbaptised, are not?

Looking at the question as a political, but in no sense as a party one, it really seems as if the Marquis of Salisbury's speech in support of the Bishop of Salisbury's Bill must absolutely exhaust the subject. It is grave, conciliatory, unanswerable. *O si sic semper!* The Bill, he believed, "without committing himself to details," "constituted the only *eirenicon* on which they could go, and was the only prospect of peace between the conflicting religious bodies." These are the words of a statesman, and, I hope, of a Christian. ABNER E. BROWN.

Kettering, May 19th, 1893.

THE Bishop of Ripon has invited Canon Bardsley, vicar of Bradford, to preach the ordination sermon in the cathedral on Sunday morning next.

ON Friday, the 19th inst., the Bishop of Carlisle delivered an address in the open air at the mid-day services for city men held in the churchyard of St. Botolph, Aldersgate-street. A vast crowd assembled to listen to his lordship, who wore his ordinary walking habit. He preached from the familiar text, "And I, if I be lifted up, will draw all men unto Me."

THE opening of the organ at Faversham Church took place on the 16th inst., nearly eighteen months since the old instrument collapsed. The reconstruction of the organ was intrusted to Mr. August Gern, of Notting Hill, and has been most satisfactorily carried out, at a cost of £900. On the day of the opening two recitals were given by the Rev. J. B. Croft, organist of St. Matthew's, Westminster. The recitals were preceded by short specially arranged services.

THE first of the Polytechnic Trips for the World's Fair, at Chicago, arrived in New York on Friday afternoon, May 12th. These trips will be continued every week up to August 5th. The parties travel by the Guion Line from Liverpool every fortnight, and from Southampton every Friday and Saturday by the Inman and Hamburg-American Lines. A few vacancies still remain. Full detailed prospectus can be obtained on application to the Secretary, the Polytechnic, 309, Regent-street, London, W.

IT became known during last week that the Rev. Robert Lawrence Ottley had been appointed to succeed Mr. Gore at the Pusey House, Oxford. The appointment had been prophesied in a good many quarters and anticipated by various newspapers. Mr. Ottley has a brilliant "record," having been Hertford, Craven, and Derby Scholar, and student of Christ Church. Subsequently he became vice-principal of Cuddesdon Theological College, and lately Fellow and Dean of Divinity in Magdalen College. He was a contributor to *Lux Mundi*.

THE Rev. Percy H. Collins, writing to the *Times*, from High Halden Rectory, Kent, makes a suggestion which, if adopted by country parishes generally, would render a most valuable aid to hospitals and crowded town parishes:—"It has been our custom in this parish to have an offertory of fresh-laid eggs one Sunday afternoon in the spring. We had this offertory last Sunday, and 610 eggs were brought into the church—that is, on an average, one egg for nearly every person in the parish. These eggs were sent up, as usual, for the sick and very poor of the parish of St. Luke, Camberwell, and I need hardly say that they have been greatly appreciated. Eggs travel well if carefully packed, and are received with a welcome which cannot be expressed in words by those who only know the subtle dictinctions between eggs expressed by the notices in the small grocers' shops in towns."

THE Rev. R. Temple, H.M.'s Inspector of Schools in Montgomeryshire and Salop, having on his retirement refused to receive a testimonial of any money value, an address has been presented to him by his friends in the district who are connected with schools. The address, after expressing regret at the severance of Mr. Temple's official connection with this district, which has lasted for thirty-five years, proceeds:—"In the conscientious discharge of an office which affects school managers and teachers so nearly, and which inevitably involves some friction, we not only recognise your skill as an examiner, but gratefully acknowledge your thoughtful consideration upon all occasions, combined as it was with the strictest impartiality. In social intercourse we have found you a genial guest, whose well-stored mind and intelligent conversation always made your presence agreeable and welcome." Mr. Temple in his reply says:—"Against the Treasury minute of 1890 which forces us to part, and against the author or authors of that minute, I shall always bear a grudge—the deeper because it compels the retirement of men perfectly able to do their work, who, at the time of their appointment, had no reason to believe such a minute would ever be issued. . . . . The friends who have signed the address are of every shade of opinion on almost every conceivable subject, and as I have never exercised the virtue (or vice) of reticence there can hardly be one amongst them who has not at some time or other disagreed with me. Indeed it is hardly too much to say that one-half of the school managers and school boards in my district have differed from me in theology, and that the other half have detested my politics. The generosity is therefore very great, on the one side of my Conservative friends who have not let politics interfere with their friendship, and on the other side of my Nonconformist friends, who, while I was constantly taking part in the services of a Church to which they do not belong, never raised an objection, but on the contrary, often laid aside their own traditions and came to hear me wherever I was preaching."

ON the 7th inst. Dr. Hopkins celebrated his jubilee as organist of the Temple Church. There was a crowded congregation in the morning, when Dr. Vaughan, the Master of the Temple, preached. At the close of his sermon he referred to the restoration of the church in 1842, and the appointment of Dr. Hopkins in the following year. He said: "It has been the peculiar charm of this church's worship that

here art has known how to conceal art, and an exquisite skill has shown itself in a yet more exquisite refraining. Here the most magnificent of instruments has been made to lead without driving, and to swell without drowning, and to support without supplanting the human voice (alone audible in heaven) of congregational praise. Power, abjuring display, has been here contented to influence. An atmosphere of holy calm has been breathed over our devotions, and the worshipper, conscious of an Invisible Presence, has found himself confessing, as he passed out silently through the ancient portal, 'It is good for me to have been there.'"

A project for the restoration of Stainburn Church (diocese of Ripon) has received an impetus owing to the vicar (the Rev. Walter Hall) having received an offer from an anonymous donor to furnish the chancel with choir stalls and other accessories, provided the chancel be fully restored and ready to receive the same by Easter, 1894. In the event of this not being so, the donor proposes to give the sum necessary for the purchase of the said furniture to the incumbent as an Easter offering for his own use. In consequence of this offer a meeting of the parishioners and others interested has been called by the vicar; and it was unanimously agreed to accept the offer. Five or six hundred pounds will be required to carry out a substantial restoration. This church is one of the most interesting ecclesiastical structures in the Province of York, and one of the very oldest churches remaining in England. Built in the Norman style the yet remaining original portions of the structure, including the font, and two windows in the south, and one in the west, can boast an antiquity of seven centuries and a half, while the venerable memorial in the churchyard—the base or socket of the great cross—remains most probably from British times. The chancel in its present form, and with its sadly diminished pitch of roof, is, with the east window, in the Perpendicular style. It would seem as if the chancel alone had been the original church, standing on what was possibly the Pre-Norman site. To this the Norman nave may have been subsequently added. The belfry at the east end of the nave seems to suggest this. In long after-years, the original church become a chancel may have needed to be rebuilt, and then it took its present comparatively modern shape.

Canon Trench, vicar of All Saints', Notting-hill, in his annual address, gives the following financial results of the freeing of his church:—For the last four years (1889-92) the offertory results (average) have been as follows: Year's offertory, £1,127, viz., Sundays, £900; week-days, £227. Distribution of offertory to parish objects, £990; to outside objects, £137. In the year 1885 (during pew-rents) they were: Year's offertory, £810, viz., Sundays, £634; week-days, £176. Distribution of offertory to parish objects, £727; outside objects, £83. For the same period (1889-92) donations and subscriptions have averaged about £1,220 per annum. In the year 1885, during pew-rents, the pew-rents yielded £520 (net), and other donations and subscriptions £412, making a total of £932. Thus *with* pew-rents the total income of the church (in 1885) was £1,742 (offertory £810, and pew-rents and other donations £932); *without* pew-rents the income has recently averaged £2,347 (offertory £1,127, and donations or subscriptions £1,220), showing a clear increase of about £600 a year. Adding in the results in St. Columb's district in 1883 (his first year of office), the communions for the parish were 7,934, and in 1892 13,755; the amount received in the offertory in 1883 was £798, and in 1892 £1,461. The attendance at church, as far as may be estimated by the number of coins contributed in the offertory, has much more than doubled, the coins of 1883 having been 54,427, and of 1892 118,489.

Mr. Huxley's Romanes lecture at Oxford on "Evolution and Ethics" on the 18th inst., drew a large audience alike of graduates, undergraduates, and strangers, though the scene was in no sense comparable to that witnessed last year when Mr. Gladstone deliverd the lecture. The lecturer, whose voice sounded ill and weary, was but imperfectly heard in the remoter parts of the Sheldonian, and his address evoked various comments. Fourth-year undergraduates reading for Greats were delighted by a criticism of the earlier Greek thinkers and fascinated by a theory which put Aristotle and Plato temporarily aside. Older men noted choice language and apt phraseology clothing even familiar ideas. Perhaps the most interesting portion was the end. The lecturer had told us that our age, like other ages before us, was passing into pessimism, and exhorted us to combat the cosmic force and keep our courage up. But while he denounced pessimism, he became himself a pessimist. He did not, he told us, believe than an ethical system could yet be derived from evolution; he did not even hold that all evolution meant progress, or that the survival of the fittest meant always the survival of the best. Some of us went away wondering whence Mr. Huxley and those who thought with him derived the ethical code to guide them in combating the cosmic force. Others recollected Mr. Froude's inaugural lecture and the strange tone of pessimism with which it, too, was pervaded.

At a meeting of the clergy of the rural deanery of Claydon, in the county of Buckingham, the Rev. Dr. James, vicar of North Marston, and Warden of Schorne College, proposed a motion expressive of the deep regret with which the resignation of his living and his office of Rural Dean by the Rev. E. M. Holmes, of Marsh Gibbon, is viewed by all his brother clergy. Appointed to Marsh Gibbon by Bishop Wilberforce in 1869, Mr. Holmes succeeded the present Dean of Ripon as Rural Dean in 1876, and Dr. James was only expressing the feelings of all present when he said that throughout those years, amid all the activities and responsibilities which belong now-a-days to the office of Rural Dean, Mr. Holmes, by his energy, courtesy, and sympathy, had gained the affection, as well as the confidence, of his neighbours. The Rev. R. Holt, vicar of Hillesden, who had been in the deanery ever since 1861, followed Dr. James with words of affectionate sympathy, and trusted that a step which to his neighbours was one that could only be a sad one would yet to Mr. Holmes be a means of restoring him soon to his old vigour and freshness, and enabling him to come back to the diocese with power and opportunity for yet a great deal of efficient work.

Suggestive Outlines for Teachers and Lay-Workers. No. 10.—Esther before the King (Esther iv. 10-17; v. 1-3). It is a good thing that the oppressed should find a true friend. Such was the case with good Queen Esther in pleading in behalf of Mordecai, whom Haman had tried to destroy. There are many good people who have been falsely accused, Joseph, Jesus, and others, many of our martyrs in early English Church. We should judge righteously

and plead for mercy and equity. Lessons: 1. Seek to have the Spirit of God. 2. Plead for right and justice. 3. Avoid the spirit of envy. 4. Do good to all. 5. God will honour the faithful. 6. God will reward the just.

PREFERMENTS AND APPOINTMENTS.

Benwell, Rev. H., M.A., Vicar of Woodhall Spa; Acting Chaplain 1st Volunteer Battalion Lincolnshire Regiment.
Blakeney, Rev. Robert Bibby, B.A., Curate of Malew, Isle of Man; Incumbent of St. Jude's, Andreas.
Bouth, Rev. Reginald Hampson Myddleton, M.A., Curate of St. Michael and All Angels', Blackburn; Rector of Elkstone, Cheltenham.
Bradbrook, Rev. Stanley, B.A., Curate of St. Leonard's, Bootle; Secretary for the Metropolitan District of the Church Pastoral Aid Society.
Bryson, Rev. David, Curate of Horton-with-Cowpen, near Blyth; Vicar of Holy Island, Berwick-on-Tweed.
Luckman, Rev. Cecil F. G., Vicar of All Saints', Quilines, Buenos Ayres; Consular Chaplain, Bahia, Brazil, Diocese of the Falkland Islands.
Morris, Rev. M. C. F., B.C.L., M.A., Vicar of Newton-on-Ouse; Rector of Nunburnholme, Yorkshire.
Oldaker, Rev. H. H., B.A., Domestic Chaplain to the Bishop of Bloemfontein; Priest-Vicar in Bloemfontein Cathedral.
Ottley, Rev. Robert Lawrence, M.A., Fellow and Dean of Divinity, Magdalen College, Oxford; Principal Librarian of the Pusey House, Oxford.
Phillips, Rev. Forbes A., Senior Curate of Tynemouth; Vicar of St. Andrew's, Gorleston, Great Yarmouth.
Powell, Rev. F. H., A.K.C., Curate of St. Matthew's, Stepney; Organising Secretary of the A.C.S. for the North-Western District.
Roach, Rev. Thomas, M.A., of Owslebury; Licensed to Officiate in the Diocese of Winchester.
Sadler, Rev. William, Rector of Dembleby (Secretary of the Jerusalem and the East Mission Fund); Commissary to Bishop Blyth.
Sheringham, Rev. H. A., Vicar of Tewkesbury-with-Walton, Cardiff; Surrogate for the Diocese of Gloucester and Bristol.
Squires, Rev. Henry C., M.A., Rector of St. Peter-le-Bailey, Oxford; Vicar of Holy Trinity, Richmond.
Stanford, Rev. C. W., M.A., Curate of St. Michael's, Louth, Lincolnshire; Rector of Wishaw, Birmingham.
Vicars, Rev. Hedley, Curate of Rugby; Rector of All Saints' and St. John's, Huntingdon.
Walsh, Rev. James Hornidge, D.D., Rector of St. Stephen's, Dublin; Examining Chaplain to the Archbishop of Dublin.
Wilson, Rev. Matthew, M.A., Curate of St. Thomas's, Hyde; Curate-in-Charge of St. Andrew's, Hyde.
Wright, Rev. Harold Hall, M.A., Precentor of Chester Cathedral; Licensed to Officiate in the Diocese of Chester.
Yonge, Rev. G., M.A.; Vicar of Hullavington, Wilts.

CLERICAL OBITUARY.

Coles, Rev. Thomas Stirling, at Chobham, Surrey, on the 13th inst., aged 79.
Corbould, Rev. W. H., Vicar of St. Paul's, Ramsbottom, Lancashire, on the 18th inst., aged 60.
Eldrid, Rev. Edwin Norton, Priest-in-charge of the Church of St. Ethelburga, London, at Dorking, on the 13th inst., aged 51.
Fenwicke, Rev. Gerard Charles, of Blaston Mann, Rector of Stockerston and Blaston, at Lucerne, on the 15th inst., aged 74.
Hayes, Rev. Thomas, at 8, Marlborough-buildings, Bath, on the 15th inst., aged 79.
Jerrard, Rev. Alfred Wilder, M.A., Head Master at the Grammar-school, Portsmouth, on the 19th inst., aged 42.
Sparks, Rev. Edmund Jenner, late Assistant-Curate at Exmouth, at Leamington, on the 17th inst., aged 27.
Upcher, Rev. Abbott, B.A., for fifty-six years Rector of the parish, at Kirby Cane Rectory, Norfolk, on the 17th inst., aged 79.
Venning, Rev. Edwin James, British Chaplain, at Cassel, on the 15th inst., aged 52.

FIRST REMOVE THE CAUSE.

MEN frequently worry and trouble themselves a great deal in trying to cure the symptoms of vital weakness' nervous exhaustion, and kindred ailments, instead of endeavouring to first remove the cause. This can be done by Mr. Harness' Electropathic Treatment without the aid of drugs. It is useless to tell sufferers to employ their minds and bodies in useful work and to forget their disorders, so long as the cause of their troubles is not removed. How can it be expected that when they are fatigued by the least exertion they can occupy themselves by studying, walking, or other exercise? Even in conversation they frequently lose the thread of it and repeatedly find their memory failing them. What can they do? Physic will not cure them—perhaps the leading physicians have failed to afford them any relief, and they have consequently become hopeless. It is to such as these that Mr. Harness' new combined Electropathic Belt and Suspensory is so strongly recommended, as, by its gentle but continuous action, invigorating electric currents are imperceptibly generated and conveyed direct from the spinal cord to the affected parts. It is this scientifically constructed and convenient appliance which silently but surely acts upon the vital organs, and removes the cause of the patient's disease, effecting a wonderful change in his health, character, and conduct, and speedily enabling him to return to his natural tastes and habits, and enjoy once more the full vigour of youth, with all its accompanying pleasures.

We may add that this perfect Electro-medical appliance is exceedingly comfortable to wear, gives wonderful support and vitality to all the internal organs of the body, prevents chills, imparts new life and vigour to the debilitated constitution, stimulates the organic action, promotes the circulation, assists digestion, and promptly renews that vital energy, the loss of which is the first symptom of decay. Its healing properties are multifarious. It stimulates the functions of various organs, increases their secretions, gives tone to muscle and nerves, relaxes morbid contractions, improves nutrition, and effectually renews exhausted nerve force. Acting directly on the system, it sustains and assists its various functions, and thus promotes the health and vigour of the entire frame. Besides these benefits, the mind is maintained in a buoyant, cheerful state, and every faculty is stimulated to the highest condition of intellectual strength.

Gentlemen who read the above announcement have only to visit London and call at the Electropathic and Zander Institute (52, Oxford Street, W.) to be convinced of the marvellous curative powers of Electricity and Mr. Harness' perfect methods of imperceptibly applying the current. The medical officers of the establishment are in daily attendance, and may be consulted free of charge either personally or by letter.

The Church of England Pulpit.

FITNESS FOR SERVICE.

By the Ven. DAVID HOWELL, B D., Vicar of Gresford, Canon Residentiary of St. Asaph, and Archdeacon of Wrexham.

Sermon Preached before the University of Cambridge on Sunday, April 30th, 1893.

"Listen, O isles, unto me; and hearken, ye people, from far; The Lord hath called me from the womb; from the bowels of my mother hath He made mention of my name; and He hath made my mouth like a sharp sword, and in the shadow of His hand hath He hid me, and made me a polished shaft; in His quiver hath He hid me; and said unto me, Thou art my servant, O Israel, in whom I will be glorified."—Isaiah xlix. 1, 2, 3.

In the previous chapters we find very glorious things spoken of the deliverance of the Jews from Babylon. But in this chapter we seem to commence a new departure, to rise to a higher strain, and to launch out into broader and grander predictions. A larger audience is invoked: "Listen, O isles, unto Me." A greater than the prophet is the speaker: "The Lord hath called me from the womb; from the bowels of my mother hath He made mention of my name." And the calling of the Gentiles to a share in the blessings of the greater redemption is clearly indicated: "I will also give thee for a light to the Gentiles, that thou mayest be my salvation unto the end of the earth."

It would not become me to attempt an elaborate exegesis of the text. Privileged to stand in this pulpit by the favour of this great University, without the high credentials of those who usually speak from this place, it would ill become me to use this opportunity in dealing with anything controversial, or to raise points of discussion which others are far more capable of handling with advantage. I regard myself much in the light of one who has just come from the battle-field, to the scene where young recruits are disciplined and trained for the great warfare of life. I might, indeed, say that I am come from the battle-field in a less figurative sense, for my beloved Principality is just now the scene of the saddest of all strifes—religious strife, strife among brethren. The collision of opinions in regard to ecclesiastical affairs may be the unavoidable outcome of those changes of ideas, aims, interests, and convictions which accompany an advanced civilisation. But to any one who has the interests of religious peace, charity, and Christian brotherhood at heart, it is none the less sad, and deeply distressing, to witness the best interests of spiritual religion so terribly injured, social life embittered, and that peculiar acerbity infused into political controversy which comes only from religious passions and prejudices. Hearty co-operation in support of social and philanthropic objects is becoming increasingly difficult; purely political questions are decided by extraneous considerations; and a highly religious and generous people are bitterly divided on the one subject which of all others ought to draw men closer together.

My purpose in selecting this passage is to use it as a solid foundation for some practical observations, as the result of more than one-third of a century spent among masses of mankind, as to some of the urgent needs of society, and the qualities required in those who would do most and best service to God and man. And by service I do not mean only that which is technically known as Christian service, the service of Christian men and women who devote their time and talents to "good works." But I mean all faithful service rendered to God and to human society. I repudiate the distinction sometimes made between sacred and secular service, for is not all true service sacred? Is not every Christlike life, a life spent in serving others, a living sacrament? Is there not a priesthood of the laity as well as of the clergy? It is not the nature of any honest vocation, but the controlling spirit of him that pursues it, which makes it menial. It is the mean man—self-centred in his aims, contracted in his sympathies, earthly in his conceptions, regardless of the rights and interests of others—it is such a man that degrades the honourable vocations of life. True service, of whatever kind it be, is an offering to God, if made on the altar of self-sacrifice.

Now the first thing suggested by the text is the call to the service appointed us of God. "The Lord hath called me from the womb." Whether this refers to the Jewish nation, or to the prophet himself, or to the Lord Jesus Christ, I will not now inquire. The important thing is, that to every human life that enters the world there is a special call, and a distinct sphere of duty. Jeremiah was called from his birth (Jer. i. 5), and so was St. Paul (Gal. i. 15). These are types, not exceptions. Their call teaches us that every human life is a real and distinct entity, a thing complete in itself, as much so to the eye of God as the grandest object in any sphere of created life. Behind all secondary causes there is a design and a purpose to each separate existence, which gives it a dignity, and makes it a necessity in the government of God. "I am"; and though my existence may be hardly more among the myriads of the human race than that of the animalcule whose birth and death barely covers a moment of time, yet is it subject to all the conditions of created life as really as that of any archangel before the throne

of God. This truth is not one easy to realise. An individual is so insignificant a thing among the millions inhabiting the surface of this globe, while the globe itself is only as a grain of sand on the seashore beside countless other worlds, that it is with no mock modesty we ask—"What is man that thou art mindful of him, or the Son of Man that thou so regardest him?" This is true, but it is none the less true that each individual life has a meaning and a mission in the plan and purpose of God; and to realise this is no unimportant element in fitness for service. Two opposite errors there are which have gone far to ruin countless human lives. One is the over-estimating, and the other is the under-estimating our importance as individuals. The former breeds vanity, conceit, obtrusiveness, self-assertion, and leads a man to force himself into positions for which he is not fitted, and for which God never intended him. The latter is the fruitful cause of countless wasted lives. From this place have gone forth, century after century, vast numbers of men, gifted, accomplished, highly trained, of whom little has been heard afterwards, lost as raindrops in the ocean, because they had no adequate sense of their individuality, of what they might be, and of what God would have them to be. It is said of one of the most distinguished sons of this University, that, in the early part of his career, he was idle, careless, and self-indulgent, until one of his companions said to him roughly one day—"What a fool you are, Paley, to live as you do. I could probably do nothing if I were to try, and can afford the life I lead; you could do everything, and cannot afford it." These words, we are told, became the turning point in an eminently useful and brilliant career. Be it then understood, that one of the first conditions of fitness for service is that we should realise that our individual existence is a call from God, and that to each human life there is a special aim and purpose: "The Lord hath called me from the womb." But here the question naturally arises, how is the Divine call to be discerned? Briefly, it may be said, that the natural predilections and inclinations of a man may, to some extent, be taken as pointing the direction in which his sphere of action lies. There are, besides, his talents, his aptitudes, his special endowments: these may be taken as some indication of the Divine call. There is, also, the concurrent direction of circumstances, and the tendency of events. Nor should a light stress be laid on the counsel and opinions of those whose experience of life, and unbiased judgment, qualify them to give sound advice. Nor, again, should the conscious promptings of some power within us, compelling us to face perhaps an unwelcome prospect, be ignored. But at no crisis in life is humble, submissive, patient, trustful waiting upon God, of greater importance than when we are responding, definitely and finally, to the call of circumstances, of inclinations, and of qualifications in the choice of life's sphere of duty. "Trust in the Lord with all thine heart, and lean not to thy own understanding. In all thy ways acknowledge Him, and He shall direct thy paths." And when the call comes, it is at our peril that we hesitate to obey it. God will not use the life that does not flow in the channel prescribed by Him. If a man tries to do what God by nature has not qualified him for, his life will be a dismal failure. He commits a double wrong—a wrong upon himself, and on the vocation into which he wrongly thrusts himself. God prospers only those instruments which he has specially fitted for their work. Alas! is not this the secret of many an empty church, and of many a spiritually dead parish? It is the testimony of of every age, that only spiritual agents can do really spiritual work. And hence the first question in our Ordination Service is—"Do you trust that you are inwardly moved by the Holy Ghost to take upon you this office and ministration?" A misgiving here must paralyse every act of service. A man who is in doubt as to whether he is where and what God would have him to be, is not likely to influence others. Still less is he who has the least doubt as to his message. Faith in one's mission, and faith in one's message, will go far to give force to all we say and do. This is one secret of spiritual strength for any and every kind of moral service, it is that we have an unquestioning conviction that we are called of God, and sent of God. "The Lord hath called me from the womb."

II. But the text brings before us, not only the call, but also the qualifications for it. "He hath made my mouth like a sharp sword, and in the shadow of His hand hath He hid me, and made me a polished shaft; and in His quiver hath He hid me." This was emphatically true of our Lord Jesus Christ. When, in the fulness of time, He was revealed to the world, His own words were—"I came not to bring peace, but a sword." Moreover, in the apocalyptic vision, the description given of His ascended and enthroned Majesty is, that of one "out of whose mouth there went a sharp two-edged sword." The same figure is also applied to the Third Person of the Holy Trinity, of whom it is said, that the "Sword of the Spirit is the word of God"—and never should it be forgotten, that Bible truth, in mind, and heart, and life and at ready command for use, is pre-eminently the instrument of power for effective service. Now the sword is the symbol of authority, as well as of war, and is intended to vindicate the true as well as to slay the false. For this we need, not only a sword, but a sharp sword. There are great and vital interests to be vindicated, the interests of truth and of humanity—that humanity which is now weltering in its helpless degradation in so many of our great centres of population. We also need a sword, and a sharp sword, to cut down errors and abuses—the hoary superstitions, and the un-

speakable evils and wrongs which now obstruct the progress of a Christ-like Christianity in the world.

But for effective service we need not only to be as sharp swords, but as "polished shafts." A polished shaft is a symbol of cultivated gifts, of trained endowments, and of aggressive power at its best. The polished shaft is not such by nature, but the polishing comes from the hand of man. The call and the gifts come from God; while the response to that call, and the due cultivation and employment of the gifts depend upon man, and if he neglects to do his part, what can his life be but a disastrous failure? To answer God's purpose in life, we must be "sharp swords" and "polished shafts."

> "We live in thoughts, not breath,
> In deeds, not years,
> He most lives who thinks the most,
> Feels the noblest, acts the best."

And to carry out the purpose of life, that purpose must be clearly and distinctly defined, and patiently pursued. Few men ever distinguish themselves much, who do not surrender themselves to the pursuit of some one main object in life. Instability is fatal to all moral force. Doubtfulness is death to all real progress. Indecision is ruinous to all consistency of character. Indefiniteness leads to that state of suspense in which it is never certain what a man believes or does not believe. Some it leads to stoical indifference, others to blank agnosticism, others to distrust everything which is not capable of demonstration, and to merge individual responsibility in the corporate responsibility of a Church which assumes infallibility. Definiteness of purpose is an essential condition of success in earthly affairs. Not the most naturally gifted, not the most highly accomplished, not the most largely helped by parents and friends, are they who reach the topmost rung in the ladder of life; but they who have the most unflinching tenacity of purpose, steadiness of aim, patient perseverance, and the sturdiest faith in God. Pertinacity of purpose will conquer more worlds than ever Alexander knew of. The reply of the Spartan father to his son, who complained that his sword was too short, "Add a step to it, my son, add a step to it?" is applicable to most things in this life, and to nothing more than to the higher kind of moral and spiritual service.

Moreover, in all true service there must be the element of sacrifice; not merely the sacrifice of time, thought, pleasure, profit, preference, but above all of self. Our Isaac must be laid on the altar, stripped, bound, and slain—at least in intention—before there can be a blending of our will with the will of God. In every truly noble life there must be self-martyrdom, yea, many martyrdoms; and all along our course there must be set up altars to God, on which we sacrifice ourselves. The old legend that the Greek host lay weatherbound, vainly waiting for a favourable wind that should waft them on to victory, and that they were obliged to sacrifice a human victim to propitiate the gods, finds a verification in the highest type of human service. It is still as ever true that "whosoever will save his life shall lose it; and whosoever will lose his life for My sake shall find it." Not only in the sublime life of the God-man, but in every life worthy of Him, in every life worthy of our redeemed humanity, there will be, there must be, the three great principles of sacrifice, intervention, and substitution, and he who is not prepared for this will never be a "sharp sword" or a "polished shaft." It was the motto of one of our Welsh princes, "*Addioddefws a orfu*" ("He who suffered conquered"), and we know of Whom it is said, that He was "made perfect through suffering." If this was the condition of perfection to Him, how much more to us? In this, as in all else, was there not something in Him that touches everything in us? Suffering is the only experience that brings us into oneness, touch, and sympathy with all our kind. And hence it is that sufferers are the true heroes of the human race. Life for life is the principle underlying all true nobility of life and character; and if the servant of Jehovah, the grand colossal figure of this book, found suffering, sacrificial, vicarious, redemptive suffering, to be the condition of service to Him, who are we that we should shrink from it? Never, then, let it be forgotten, to use the quaint saying of an old divine, that "adversity is a good university," and that affliction means promotion in the school of grace.

One more element in fitness for service must I mention, viz., that moral chivalry which goes by the name of disinterestedness. Here is a key which has rarely, if ever, failed to open the most obdurate of human hearts. What is it that, beyond all else, wins the admiration of all sorts and conditions of men? What is it that commands the homage of savage and civilised alike, those who have hardly anything in common besides? Not personal courage or exploits in the battle-field. Not success in government, or "good luck" in the pursuits of life. Not brilliant eloquence, or profound learning, or gifts of genius. These things have a marvellous power over man. But there are myriads of the human race whom they do not move at all. There are millions of human hearts whom these things do not impress, beyond a mere transient emotion. But there is one thing which makes a man a hero wherever men know the difference between right and wrong, and that is disinterestedness. Was it not so with him who is for ever enshrined in the affections of the human race, the incomparable hero of the Soudan, the martyr of Khartoum? What was it that made him what he was? It was not that he was braver than other men. It was not that he had fought greater battles or won more brilliant victories than other men. What was it, then, that made him master of savage hordes, and his name a greater power over the wild tribes of the desert than myriads of armed men? What was it that

made him trusted wherever he went, and his bare word to be taken as law wherever his name was known? Was it not, above all things else, his most sublime disinterestedness? Was it not this that lifted him as much above ordinary men as if he had belonged to a higher and a diviner race? And what shall we say of Him whose grace made Gordon what he was? What shall we say of His disinterestedness? "Ye know the grace of our Lord Jesus Christ, that though He was rich, yet for your sakes He became poor, that ye through His poverty might be rich." "For scarcely for a righteous man will one die; yet peradventure for a good man some would even dare to die. But God commendeth His love towards us, in that while we were yet sinners Christ died for us."

I have done. I am profoundly conscious that I am addressing men who will soon enter into the great warfare of life, and who cannot fail to exercise a vast influence on human society, in our own, and it may be in other lands. They will have their share in shaping and guiding the destinies of this great empire. It will be theirs to bear an important part in raising, or lowering, the standard of morality in the corporate life of this nation. To them, as to their predecessors, it will be largely given to guide the masses in steadfast adherence, not only to the principles of social morality, and loyalty to the laws and institutions of this ancient realm, but to the foundation truths of revealed religion, on which alone rest securely both the morals and institutions of civilised life. Definite purposes, formed and fashioned on fixed principles; honourable aspirations, quickened and constrained by strong convictions; a deep, inspiring sense of the sacredness of life, its mission and its responsibilities, polished and perfected by study and self-discipline, and, above all, purified and sanctified through the operations of God the Holy Ghost—these are essential conditions. I will not say only for the success of human life, but even to save that life from distress and disaster. That life, with all its opportunities and posibilities, is the gift of God, and can only be brought to a successful issue—can only answer its original purpose, and attain to its original destiny—by our giving it back again to Him, in consecrated service, to the glory of His Name, through Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen.

THE Rev. Stephen Gladstone, who was seized with sudden illness on Tuesday, the 23rd ult., is now reported to be regaining strength. Mr. Gladstone read both Lessons at Hawarden Church on Sunday, in the absence of the rector.

BY an order in Council the Ecclesiastical Commissioners have extended the boundaries of the parish of St. Catherine's, Edge-hill, Liverpool, so as to include within its limits a further portion of the parish of West Derby, being a part of the conventional district of St. Mary's, Edge-hill.

HOW "CHRIST DIED FOR OUR SINS ACCORDING TO THE SCRIPTURES."

BY THE REV W. T. HOBSON, VICAR OF ST. BARNABAS, DOUGLAS.

SERMON PREACHED IN ST BARNABAS' CHURCH, DOUGLAS, ON GOOD FRIDAY, MARCH 30th 1893.

"For these things were done that the Scripture should be fulfilled, A bone of Him shall not be broken; and again another Scripture saith, They shall look on Him whom they pierced."—JOHN xix. 36, 37.

THESE words are a remarkable instance and example of what is very noticeable in the Gospel narratives, that not only do the Scriptures as a whole testify of Jesus so that they were, and are, and shall be, *generally* fulfilled in Him; but that very specially, as the atonement death of Jesus is the great central event of sacred history, aye, of the history of the universe, so the fulfilments of the Old Testament Scriptures become closer and more frequent as they come nearer—like the radii of a circle as they approach its centre—to that event which we specially commemorate to-day, to the crucifixion and death of Jesus; that as Jesus Himself said, "The Son of Man goeth as it is written of *him*." In the disciples forsaking Him and fleeing, as they did at the first approach of danger to their Lord, in their being armed with two swords, in the soldiers' piercing His hands and His feet with the crucifixion nails, in their parting His garments among them and casting lots upon His vesture, in His being "lifted up" like the serpent in the wilderness, in His being crucified between two malefactors, in His being buried in the rich man's tomb; in all these things as well as in His saying "I thirst" and their giving Him gall and vinegar to drink, in the cry being forced from His lips "My God, my God, why hast Thou forsaken Me"—in all this prescribed tale of suffering that He underwent, what was written of Him was fulfilled in Him. It shows how it was indeed according to "the determinate counsel and foreknowledge of God" that He was delivered to the death He died, and was by wicked hands crucified and slain. While men were working their own wicked wills, they were in fact fulfilling the great and gracious purposes of God. He can, and He does, make the wrath of man even against Himself to praise Him. He can force the sin of man to take the shape that suits His own designs of grace and love, to flow in the channel of His foreordained counsels of holy wisdom; and that without His doing so either adding to, or taking from, the sinfulness of sin in the least; either increasing or diminishing the volume or the force of its malignity in any measure or degree. It shows how deep in the eternal mind of God was His purpose to glorify Himself, to redeem mankind and to consolidate the throne of

His everlasting Kingdom by the sacrifice of the death of Christ, by His Incarnate Son dying, as on this day, as the propitiation for the sin of the whole world. It ought not only to confirm our faith in our whole religion as being divinely true, but very specially to strengthen our faith and to deepen our joy of faith in this great fact and doctrine of of our religion, the atonement death of Jesus, His having appeared at His Incarnation birth "to put but away sin," as on this day, "by the sacrifice of Himself."

We have in our text, as I have said, a remarkable instance of the frequency of these alleged fulfilments of Scripture in the circumstances of the death of Christ. In the two verses of our text that lie side by side on the sacred page we have two of those fulfilments pointed out; and those two coming to pass in, we might almost say, the one circumstance: in what was *not* done and in what *was done* instead on the one occasion; in a certain act and deed, which took place as usual in such a case with the crucified robbers, not being done in our Lord's case, and in something else quite unusual being done to Him instead. Crucifixion was a lingering death, that was part of the terribleness of it. No mortal part of the body was especially affected by it, consequently the crucified person hung sometimes for days in agony upon the cross until his strength was exhausted in the strife with the manifold suffering, or even until he was starved to death. And so in the course of nature it might have been with the three that were crucified as on this day on Calvary. But nature's course was interrupted in the case of all three—in our Lord's case, and in that of the two crucified with Him. In His case He voluntarily yielded up the ghost when once the full tale of suffering was completed, when He had drunk to the very dregs the bitter cup which the Father had given Him to drink. He laid down His life of Himself. No man took it from Him. Thus He died so soon that Pilate marvelled when he heard that He was already dead. So it was with Him. How was it with the other two? It was the Jews' preparation day, the preparation day for the Passover Sabbath; and it was contrary to Jewish law and custom that a body should remain on the cross on the Sabbath day. So orders were obtained and given that their deaths should be hastened by their legs being broken as they hung on the cross, and that they should be taken away for burial before the Sabbath began that same evening. Accordingly the soldiers first brake the legs of the two malefactors who were evidently still living. But coming to Jesus they found that He was dead already, so they brake not His legs; but a soldier with a spear pierced His side, and thereout flowed that mystic stream of blood and water—as if to show that not only justification by His blood, but regeneration and cleansing and renewal by His Spirit come to sinful men from His death as the sacrifice for sin. It was on the soldier's part probably a mere piece of wanton savagery, or in that way he would make assurance doubly sure that the crucified Jesus, who seemed dead, was dead indeed. And we may say that in the providence of God the soldier's savage act served a useful purpose for the Church. The time soon came, even before St. John fell asleep, when so firmly was it believed that He was God that men were tempted to deny that He was really man, and that He actually and truly died. Then every such circumstance as this was specially precious and useful as proving that He had indeed come in the flesh, that He was as truly Man as He was truly God, that He died indeed; was not only crucified, but *dead* and buried.

What then were the two Scriptures that were so fulfilled? One was what was written in the Book of Exodus xii. 46 concerning the Passover lamb, "Neither shall ye brake a bone thereof." "A bone of it," or "of *him*," "shall not be broken." This as specially ordained for the type must be fulfilled in the antitype — Christ our Passover sacrificed for us. It was indeed written in the law of Moses concerning Him.

The other was when Jehovah by the mouth of His holy prophet, Zechariah, declared concerning a time yet to come when all nations shall be gathered together in siege against Judah and against Jerusalem. "And it shall come to pass in that day that I will seek to destroy all the nations that come against Jerusalem. And I will pour upon the house of David, and upon the inhabitants of Jerusalem, the spirit of grace and of supplication, and *they shall look upon Me whom they have pierced*, and they shall mourn for Him as one mourneth for his only son, and shall be in bitterness for Him as one that is in bitterness for his first-born."

You see one of these Scripture fulfilments was of a type that had long been used in the past, while the other referred to a prediction yet to be fulfilled in the future. Let us further consider both of these.

Why was it so expressly ordained concerning the Paschal lamb that "a bone of it should not be broken"? For no possible or imaginable reason as regarded *it*. Godly and intelligent Jews in all the centuries of their keeping the Passover in Israel might often have wondered why it was. I know not if they ever imagined any reason for it; but I am sure they knew of none. None ever did know the reason why, till the type had its fulfilment in Jesus. All was dark in that respect, as in all that concerned the Passover—why God delivered Israel out of Egypt in such close connection with the slaying and eating of the Passover lamb in each house—until the true Lamb became the light thereof. Then it dawned on true Israelites what was the meaning of it all, why it was so ordained for them and for their fathers of old time. It was so with the Paschal lamb of Israel's redemption out of Egypt, because

it must be so with Jesus, the true Paschal Lamb of our redemption out of the bondage of Satan, sin, and death.

But then the question arises for us, Why must it have been so with Him? When He was scourged with the terrible Roman rods, when His sacred brow was torn with the crown of thorns, when His hands and His feet were allowed to be pierced by the crucifixion nails, when it was permitted that His side should be pierced with the spear, why was that other indignity not permitted? It can hardly be, surely, that He should be spared any unnecessary indignity. There must be some other reason which surely it is consistent with deepest reverence to seek for, even if it be not given us to find it. But I think it is a sufficient reason, which readily suggests itself, that it would have been unsuitable in connection with His resurrection on the third day. He must on the Easter morn be indeed "the Lamb as it had been slain," with the crucifixion wounds in His hands and feet and side; but He must be also a perfect man. There must be no broken limb to mar the perfection of His risen manhood. But then it may occur to some of you to say, what about the malefactors? What about the pardoned and saved believer of the two? Must not he too rise from the dead in a resurrection to eternal life and in the likeness of His risen Lord? Yes, but there was this manifest difference between our Lord in His resurrection and that of any of His people. He must rise with the same body that was crucified, dead and buried. His body must be seen and shown to be the same as men saw and knew in the days of His flesh; this was necessary in His case, for the important purpose of His resurrection being proved beyond any doubt, so that an unbelieving Thomas may be bid to reach forth His hand, and thrust it into the spear wound in His side, as well as to behold the print of the nails in His hands. The witnesses of His resurrection must be able to speak of the Word of life as what they had seen with their eyes, and their hands had handled, evidently the crucified one risen again. The very same body, whatever resurrection change from the mortal to the immortal may have passed upon it, as had been laid lifeless in the tomb. But none of this is necessary in our case. It is "not that body that shall be" that in our case is laid in the grave. The resurrection body shall be one given to each as God shall please, wherewith to clothe again and for ever the naked disembodied spirit of the departed saint. Many a Christlike soul, made Christlike in the regeneration and by the renewing of the Holy Ghost, has dwelt all through this mortal life in a maimed, misshapen, and crippled body, has had its earthly tabernacle dwelling sadly rent and torn by accident, or disease, or in battle, or in martyrdom; but all Christlike souls will in the resurrection receive a perfect body glorified and immortal, and so be clothed upon with their eternal house not made with hands, after the pattern of the glorified Jesus. *Their* bones may be broken, but their *Lord's* must not. And so not a bone of the Paschal lamb, the type of the dying Lamb of God, must be broken either. In God's appointment of that type of Christ there was plainly a thought of His not only laying down His life in sacrifice for the sins of the world, but also taking it again and for ever in resurrection newness of eternal life. In the providence of God, it happened that, for the fulfilling of that Scripture which was written concerning His Son, and for the fulfilling of His all-wise purpose in the matter, the Roman soldiers brake not His legs when they brake the legs of the others that were crucified with Him. But one of the soldiers with a spear pierced His side instead, and so another Scripture was fulfilled, which said "they shall look upon Him whom they pierced." And, oh, consider in what connection that is said! Here we are led to look forward from the suffering and death, not merely to the resurrection, but beyond the ascension and the present sitting on the right hand of God, to the coming again in His glorious majesty. It is then that repentant Israel shall look on Him whom they pierced with that Roman spear. It is then that as Jehovah says, "They shall look on Me whom they pierced." And not Israel only. "Behold," says the beloved disciple who beheld when they pierced His side, as He hung dead upon the cross, "behold, He cometh with clouds, and every eye shall see Him, and they also which pierced Him, and all the tribes of the earth shall mourn because of Him." Aye, then, as Jesus Himself testified, "Then shall all the tribes of the earth mourn, and they shall see the Son of Man coming on the clouds of heaven with power and great glory." Our text thus links together the sufferings of Christ which had just ended in the death upon the cross with the glory that should follow, even the glory in which He shall come from sitting down with the Father on His throne, to sitting down for ever on His own throne, the throne of this world. It is the Lamb that was slain that shall take the kingdom. "The head that once was crowned with thorns is crowned with glory now." And when every knee shall bow to Him, and every tongue shall confess that Jesus Christ is Lord, to the glory of God the Father, then every eye shall see that it is the once crucified Jesus, that it is He whom they pierced on Calvary, who sits upon the throne, when the kingdom over the world has become the kingdom of our Lord and of His Christ, and He shall reign for ever and ever.

"Lo He comes with clouds descending,
Once for favoured sinners slain;
Every eye shall now behold Him,
Robed in awful majesty;
Those who set at nought and sold Him,
Pierced and nailed Him to the tree,
Deeply wailing,
Shall the true Messiah see."

My brethen, all that are His shall be glorified with Him then. All the children of God are called into the fellowship of His Son Jesus Christ. That means a fellowship in His glory hereafter. Yes, but it means first a fellowship in His sufferings here. It is a faithful saying, aye, and a most reasonable saying too, "If we suffer with Him, we shall reign with Him." We must not expect to share His throne and His crown, if we shrink from His cross, unless we take up our cross now, and day by day follow Him as His disciples. Let us not forget that we not only hope to be saved through His merits, not only hope for life from His death, but that we profess to be followers of the crucified Jesus, of Him who pleased not Himself, who, having for us men and for our salvation come down from heaven, having humbled Himself to become man and to be the Father's servant for our sakes', was obedient to the Father, even unto death, yea, the death upon the cross. May God grant us each and all more and more of the mind that was in Him. May He arm us with the same mind as that wherein He suffered for us in the flesh. May He grant us each and all to be among those of whom it shall be said that "they overcame by the blood of the Lamb," and, like Him, "loved not their lives unto the death" for His sake; that so it may be given us having overcome, to sit down with Him on His throne, even as He overcame, and is set down with His Father on His throne.

WE are asked to state that the notice of the appointment of the Rev. R. H. M. Bouth to the rectory of Elkstone, Cheltenham, contained in our last issue, is premature, as the living will not be vacant for some months.

THE vicar of Oswestry (the Rev. Cecil Hook), who has, on account of the state of his health, been obliged to winter abroad for two years in succession, returned to Oswestry on Wednesday evening, his health being very materially improved. A "welcome home" to Mr. and Mrs. Hook was given in the Victoria Rooms on Thursday. It took the form of a conversazione, and was largely attended by the parishioners.

DR. LIDDELL'S many admirers will, we hope, be glad to hear that his statue is to be erected, through the munificence of two Christ Church men, in the empty niche on the north side of the deanery tower, so as to correspond to the statue of Dr. Fell, which he himself erected on the south side. It is understood also that Dr. Liddell will receive this summer, at Commemoration, the honorary D.C.L., which he was unable to receive in 1892.

THE Hort memorial has met with a ready response at Cambridge, though the scheme of the committee would be much more fully realised if additional contributions were sent them. They intend to obtain a replica of an existing portrait by Mr. Jacomb Hood, and to extend the balance to the University as a fund to be used in connection with theological research, partly for assisting publication, and sometimes perhaps to supply grants of the nature of travelling studentships.

NOTICES.

All communications respecting the Literary portion of the paper should be addressed to the Editor.

Business communications of every kind should be addressed to Dr. S. GIBBON, at the CHURCH OF ENGLAND PULPIT Office, 160, Fleet Street, London, E.C., to whom cheques and Post-office orders for subscriptions (in advance), three months, 2s., six months, 3s. 6d., twelve months, 6s. 6d., are to be made payable.

The Cases for binding Vol. XXXIV. are now ready.

FOR HEALTH AND IMMORTALITY.

The Ecclesiastical Review.

SATURDAY, JUNE 3, 1893.

PREBENDARY EYTON AND THE "WELSH CHURCH."

THE friends of the Church in Wales may well wish her no worse enemies than Prebendary Eyton. This gentleman stands almost alone among the clergy as a supporter of the Welsh Suspensory Bill; his letters to the *Guardian*, and his recent speech at the Christian Social Union meeting, represent all he has to say for it. Of his correspondence we need only remark that Prebendary Eyton shows himself in it ignorant of such an important matter as the history of tithes; his speech merits a little more attention.

In the first place it represents the only attempt at a counterblast to the great Church demonstration in the Albert Hall, which has hitherto remained unanswered, and probably will remain so. It is also Prebendary Eyton's own justification for taking a line entirely apart from the entire profession to which he belongs; in fact, it is the very most that he can say for his policy and himself. It is well to know the worst.

Prebendary Eyton begins by scolding the bishops for holding what he is constrained to call a "great and magnificent service and meeting." He does not attempt to criticise it. All he does is to find fault with them for not acting in the same way on other occasions in connection with the sweating system and "unrighteous national wars." Prebendary Eyton is quite sharp enough to detect his own fallacy. Such a demonstration as that of the Albert Hall must be held when a clear issue is to be decided. What such issue is connected with the sweating system? It is a mixed social and commercial problem, it does not depend upon any one measure one way or the other; concerning it

there is nothing defined, either to support or to condemn. To hold a demonstration about it would be mere air-beating. It is an affair of individual conscience and personal effort. Prebendary Eyton has too much common sense to imagine that any good would be done by a mass meeting of any church passing a resolution to the effect that this meeting condemns the sweating system.

The remark about "unrighteous national wars" was simply playing to the gallery. We know that war and peace are not matters of private opinion and prejudice. Wars are generally entered upon at the will of the great majority of the nation. It would be great presumption on the part of bishops, or any other people, to convene meetings of protest against the action of the executive carrying out the wishes of the nation in affairs of foreign policy. It is not possible for our bishops to have the knowledge and experience necessary for deciding such affairs, and, without that knowledge and experience, it would be impossible to determine that a war was "unrighteous." In fact there has been no war within Prebendary Eyton's recollection, which is yet agreed to have been "unrighteous," or against which the nation would have protested at the invitation of all the bishops on the bench. This cheap sneer at the Albert Hall demonstration was pointless.

Prebendary Eyton then passes on to draw a parallel with the Irish Church. No doubt in 1856 many people said about the Church in Ireland very much what is said now about the Church in Wales. They were wrong, that is all, but a flaw in your opponent's logic does not correct the fallacies in your own. What may have been said about the Irish Church was opinion merely; what is now said is historical fact. And the historical fact is that whereas the Irish Church was of foreign origin and of official creation, an innovation supported by a small minority of the population, the Church in Wales is nothing of the kind. It is of ancient institution, independent in its origin of any secular authority, and recognised for many centuries as the Church of the entire people. The Nonconformity which now tries to oust it is the "alien" Church. These are historical facts, and are not to be shaken by any mistaken inferences drawn years ago about the Irish Church.

Prebendary Eyton's next argument about the separability of the Church in Wales and England largely depends upon the last. The inference drawn from educational and temperance legislation is not very cogent. These are matters of local and even parochial administration, and not even Prebendary Eyton would propose to disestablish the Church by parishes. And he does not attempt to explain away the great fact that the diocesan boundaries insist upon the oneness of the Church in both countries; bits of Wales are in English dioceses, bits of England are in Welsh dioceses, and have been for more than a thousand years. This hardly bears out the theory of a distinct Church in either country.

We now come to the question of disestablishment, right or wrong. Here Prebendary Eyton has only to fall back upon the representation fallacy, which he is shrewd enough not to analyse, but wraps in a cloud of verbiage. It has been shown *ad nauseam* that the actual votes at the last election were but as five to three, not to add the fact that disestablishment was neither the sole nor even the chief issue before the electors. And a Parliamentary election leaves altogether out of account the women and the poor, for the latter of whom most certainly Nonconformity does not cater. It is unfortunate for Prebendary Eyton that he instanced the Calvinistic Methodists as representing the Welsh nation on its conscious and purposeful side. This is the sect whose new members, in 1892, showed a decline of about one in eight on 1882, in spite of the great increase in population.

Mr. Eyton then expends much eloquence on the question of robbery. On those who do not use the plea of robbery this is wasted; and as Mr. Eyton's argument depends on the analogy of "impropriate" tithes, it will be lost upon all those who, with some justice, consider them also robbery.

A great deal of declamation about Mr. Gladstone needs no consideration.

In the concluding portion of his speech Mr. Eyton combines a protest against being considered a party man and a declaration of sympathy, after the fashion of the Walrus and the Carpenter, with the Church he desires to mutilate. We will strive to accept Mr. Eyton's disclaimer, though it is very strange that, without being a political partizan, he is always constrained to support the Liberal party. On this head his protests remind us of Mrs. Micawber. How on earth could the Liberal party attack the Nicene Creed? And why should they attack Church education in Church schools when they have hit upon the simpler plan of killing Church schools altogether, wherein Mr. Eyton, this admirable non-party man, still appears to support them? Mr. Eyton is not able to withstand another cheap sneer by comparing in the style of Draper's "Conflict between Religion and Science," the Church of Rome in its most corrupt periods with the Church which, in its Articles, expressly declares that the Church of Rome "hath erred."

Concerning his expressions of sympathy with the Church in Wales, we need only point out that he fully admits that vast energy and endeavour which is bearing fruit all over Wales, but on the denial of which the Nonconformists wholly base their demand for disestablishment. In effect he says that the Church is doing so well that it ought to be disestablished to encourage it to do better, which reminds us of a familiar expression in Euclid. Granting the good the Church is doing, Mr. Eyton might at least have left it to the men who do the

work to decide the manner in which it may best be done. The one thing lacking in his peroration was a spirited offer to give up a wealthy and fashionable West-end church, not dependent upon tithes, and work a poor Welsh rural parish on disestablishment and disendowment principles.

And this represents all that Prebendary Eyton can say in defence of his position. There is no new argument, no attempt to meet any criticism, no refutation, for instance, of any one of the learned and authoritative utterances at "that great and magnificent" meeting to which he alludes. It is quite clear that Prebendary Eyton knows very little upon the subject, and has taken no pains to inform himself. His speech, containing no precise information and no proofs, is just what a fluent man could put together from reading newspaper reports of speeches made by his own side, which is probably just what he has done. Prebendary Eyton has not taken up the question of disestablishment from any sound conviction, that is quite clear. We acquit him of political motives, but not of political bias. He is in the habit of acting with the Liberal party, and he has been constrained by the force of habit in an affair in which he had little interest and less knowledge. And therefore we wish the Church in England, as in Wales, no worse enemies.

MEMORY.

MEMORY is the storehouse of the soul, it stands at the seat of reason, and is the preserver of the brain's wanderings. Time tries to throw a curtain of oblivion over the past, but memory penetrates through its mists, and lights up its shadows.

Memory may prove a true friend or an unsparing foe, a blessing or a curse. It stands out before us like a sentry to bear record against us if duty compels, whose eyes we cannot blind by dust.

Its enemy, Forgetfulness, may for a time endeavour to protect us from its vigilant search, but in the end it masters its would-be adversary.

Memory stands by us from the cradle to the grave, as the treasurer, to reward or punish; it is with us from reason's first dawn, and it remains until reason has reached maturity. Memory is beside us still at the closing scene, when the battle of existence is over. It is our Judge, our King, either to pass sentence of doom, or to reward us with the olive branch of peace. Memory is the angel who rolls away the stone that would ensepulchre our delinquencies. — DAISY ST. AUBYN.

THE Bishop of Liverpool has fixed October 25th and 26th for the next diocesan conference, preceded by a working men's meeting on October 23rd.

THE *Westminster Gazette* says that the Bishop of Bangor is closing the palace, assigning as the reason his inability to maintain such a large establishment upon the present income of the bishopric, there being payable to his predecessor, who lives at Bournemouth, £2,000 annually out of an income of £4,500. Bishop Campbell resigned in 1890, having held the bishopric thirty years.

Reviews and Notices.

"TEXTS AND STUDIES," Vol. I., No. 1: "The Apology of Aristides" By the Rev. J. Rendel Harris and the Rev. J. Armitage Robinson. Cambridge University Press.

"LECTURES ON ECCLESIASTICAL HISTORY," delivered in Norwich Cathedral. "The Apology of Aristides." By the Rev. J. A. Robinson. Nisbet and Co.

THE existence of this early Christian writing was known both to Eusebius and to Jerome, the former of whom states that it was presented to the Emperor Hadrian, and the latter that it was interwoven with the opinions of the Greek philosophers. It was also known to Usuardus, a Christian martyrologist of the ninth century, who says that it contained an account of the martyrdom of Dionysius, the legendary Areopagite, and first Bishop of Athens.

Nothing more was known of it until fifteen years ago (1878), when a fragment was discovered of an Armenian translation in the celebrated Armenian convent at Venice. In 1889 a complete Syriac translation was found by Professor Rendel Harris in a MS. at the convent at Mount Sinai, and was already in the press, with an English translation, when Mr. Robinson discovered that the Greek text had been long ago embodied in a very ancient romance, called "Barlaam and Joasaph" (or Josaphat), which had been translated into most European languages, and had been very popular in the Middle Ages, and was famous from the very curious fact that it is itself a Christianised version of the Buddhist legend of Gautama. In this romance a Christian teacher introduces a speech in defence of Christianity, which proves to be the Apology of Aristides, without the author's name. This address is employed for the instruction of the Indian prince Joasaph, who is himself Gautama, the Buddha, and has (curiously enough) been canonised as a Christian saint, and admitted as such into the calendar both of the Roman and of the Greek Churches.

Thus there exist two copies of this ancient Apology, one in Syriac and the other in Greek, besides a considerable fragment in Armenian. Our readers will permit us to confess our ignorance of Syriac and Armenian, and accept from us for what they may be worth our observations on the Greek embedded in the romance of Barlaam and Joasaph, and on Mr. Rendel Harris's translations of the two more abstruse Oriental tongues.

The two complete versions differ much from each other, the Syriac being much more diffuse than the Greek, but they are evidently based on the same original document. The question therefore arises, which of the two may be supposed to be the exactest reproduction of the original? We should answer this question decidedly in favour of the Greek. It is the more simple, terse, and clear. It contains fewer expressions which seem to belong to a later age than that of Aristides; and, especially in its description of the morals of the Christians, it reproduces, in almost the identical words, the famous passage on the Two Ways, which is known to have been current in the earliest Church, and which is preserved to us in substance both in the Didache and in the Epistle of Barnabas. It is probable, however, that the authors of both versions dealt very freely with their original, the author of that which the Syriac translator used by way of amplification, and the author of the Greek copy by way of abridgement; so that the

actual, unaltered Apology, as it came from Aristides' hand, may yet remain to be discovered, though it cannot be doubted that we have the substance of it before us preserved with more or less exactness in both these versions.

It does not, however, quite bear out the description of it given by early writers. It can hardly be said, with Jerome, to be interwoven with the opinions of Greek philosophers. The definition of Deity, with which it opens, and which it uses as a standard of comparison, to which to refer the ideas prevalent among the votaries of the different religions of the world, evidently originated in Greek philosophy; but there is little else in the work that can be traced to that source; and it certainly does not contain that account of the martyrdom of Dionysius which Usuardus found in his copy. Thus each version alike may diverge considerably from their original, both by omissions and by additions.

It remains to be considered, what is the value of the work, of which we have undoubtedly recovered the substance? It cannot be said to be a powerful defence of Christianity in presence of the other religions of the world. For this the author's view of those other religions is far too superficial. He is well acquainted with the Greek legends, but beyond these he has very little knowledge. Respecting the Oriental religions, he has only a vague idea that the Chaldeans, or Barbarians, worshipped the elements. Though, by a strange chance, his work became afterwards embedded in a romance, whose scene was laid in India, and which borrowed much of its matter from an Indian legend, he himself had no knowledge of the two great religions already ancient in that country; and, when dealing with the religion of Egypt, he shows no perception of the fact that the priests of that wonderful country were the first to form and popularise a belief in the resurrection of the body, in a judgment of God upon man's works and character, and in a life beyond this present one. The two versions contain two distinct accounts of the tenets and practices of the Jews; but both of these are superficial, and, it must be added, both prejudiced and uncharitable. Nowhere does the author show the slightest perception that spiritual truths may be embodied in the other religions of the world, and that those religions may have been, in their measure, and for their age, dispensations of God to mankind. Perhaps, living in a time when all these religions were corrupted and decayed, these flagrant corruptions prevented him from seeing in them the shadows of truth and goodness that they had once contained. Nor had he reached the idea, which perhaps has only become prevalent in our own time, that in making out a case, for our own religion, and against its rivals, it is necessary to be, before all things, candid and just. Thus, in itself, as a defence of Christianity, the Apology of Aristides is of little value.

Nor is its value great in the historical point of view. It has no historical allusions, no local colour, no marks of time, no description of external Christian practices and customs, such as are the most interesting part of some of the other apologies. Its sketch of Christian history and doctrine is as superficial as those of the tenets and history of the heathen religions. It is possible, as its editors have shown, to extract from its statements, the few articles of the simplest and most elementary Christian creed. But there is to be found in it not even the first beginnings of a theology, such as we find not only begun, but considerably developed in Justin Martyr. It never seems to occur to Aristides that the objections which he has alleged against several of the Greek gods, that they were born, were liable to suffering, and died, and therefore cannot be divine, may equally be brought against his own Christ. Indeed, he presents no intellectual defence of Christianity at all, but rests his case on the pure morality of the Christians, of which he draws a very pleasing, though, it must be feared, exaggerated picture. This last was the strong point of all the Christian advocates of that period. Though the Christians were not all that their panegyrists represented them to be, yet they were morally far above the world around them. They had a perfect law of human duty recorded for them in the Gospels, and inculcated on them by the teachers in their congregations; and to the obedience of this law they approached far nearer, both as congregations and as individuals, than any other communities or persons in the world. It was this moral superiority, this new way of life, which won for them the victory over perishing heathenism.

Let us, in conclusion, express our warmest thanks to Mr. Harris and Mr. Robinson for the conscientious and diligent labour by which they have rescued from oblivion this interesting relic of Christian antiquity.

CORRESPONDENCE.

To the Editor of the CHURCH OF ENGLAND PULPIT AND ECCLESIASTICAL REVIEW.

DISENDOWMENT A NATIONAL LOSS.

SIR,—I quite agree with your remarks regarding the above subject prefacing the Bishop of Manchester's speech. I am sure it is nothing less than downright robbery how, in the name of common consistency, such a subject could be advanced by one of England's greatest Statesmen. I cannot for a moment comprehend, especially from one in whom we should have expected a defender, of him who takes part in the services of the same Church universal, and whose son is also the recipient of a good living in the same establishment. I say we can hardly understand such a man; where can we draw the line? Who can conceive of such an undertaking? Who can conceive of the effrontery of such wholesale spoilation and sacrilege? Surely if such a thing is done we have robbed God of all that is dear and sacred.

THOMAS HEATH.

Plymouth.

SUGGESTIVE HINTS FOR TEACHERS AND LAY-WORKERS, No. 11.—Keeping the Sabbath. (Nehemiah xiii. 15-22): We find the prophet sadly complaining in his day of those who were breaking the Sabbath by trading and working their merchandise, he reminded them how the Lord punished them who profaned the Sabbath Day. The keeping of the Sabbath is one of the great commandments which the Lord gave to Moses for the children of Israel to keep; we should do no unnecessary work on the Sabbath, but should rest from all worldly toil. It is divinely instituted both for man and beast. Lessons: 1. We should remember the Sabbath Day. 2. We should not violate God's command. 3. God will not honour those that break His laws. 4 We cannot prosper in doing evil. 5. Learn to do well.—Reverence and Fidelity (Eccles.

v. 1-12): We should consider that the Bible enforces with telling injunctions that we should be mindful and faithful to things pertaining to this mortal state, We may very soon see this demonstrated by the enforcement of righteous laws in our highly civilised country. The more these laws and injunctions based on Biblical authority, are observed and maintained, the higher point of ethical standard we shall reach as a nation and people. In all the ramifications pertaining to secular matters there must be no slothfulness and indifference. There must be that fervency of spirit maintained to culminate and develop in the grand work of serving the Lord with all our heart, soul, and strength. Then it is we demonstrate the ideal of a living epistle read and known by all men. Need I say this is what the world needs. There must be no time-serving motives and grovelling after position and power and money, etc. There is no time to waste over things of whose issues little or no good can come. Life is brief; the longest life is but short. Therefore our lives must be spent in the advancement of our spiritual life and character to the glory of God and an example and influence to those around us. Hence we may learn the example of Christ and the most devoted and illustrious who have trod this earth, and even at this present time of those whose example resembles their great exemplar. Yes, indeed, He has left us a glorious example that we should follow His steps. Therefore may our lives be distinguished with genuine reverence and fidelity to God in all the ramifications of life; let our whole course be one marked by singular uprightness, guided by an unerring eye and a hand that can never err, and He whose judgment and wisdom is infinite, He must be our constant friend and pilot. Let us learn a few lessons: 1. Be zealous in all things lawful and right. 2. Seek the Christian virtues. 3. Pray for more of the grace of God. 4. Serve the Lord with godly fear. 5. Do not trust your own strength. 6. The Lord Jesus will give you all necessary blessings and help. — THOMAS HEATH, Plymouth.

LORD HALIFAX, presiding on Tuesday at Pocklington at an influential and numerously-attended meeting of the clergy, churchwardens, and chief parishioners of the rural deanery of Pocklington, said that the Welsh Suspensory Bill had for its object the depriving of Church people of the churches and glebe lands left ages ago for the maintenance of Divine worship and for the common good. This was a question lifted up above the plane of politics. There was no difference between the right by which the Church held her property, and the right by which Nonconformists held their endowments, or private persons their own possessions. If there were any difference it was in the Church's favour, for her title extended back a thousand years and more. No one could have more personal affection for Mr. Gladstone than he himself, yet when he saw principle bartered for votes he was driven to the conclusion that such conduct was disgraceful. If Home Rule could be carried only by disendowment of the Church so much the worse for Home Rule. Disendowment meant the merciless robbery of the poor of that which was intended for their highest and best interests in this life and the life to come. Only let Liberal and Conservative Churchmen alike unite, and this attack upon the Church would prove only an incident in her splendid onward march.

THE Rev. Arthur Robins, rector of Holy Trinity, Windsor, will read a paper upon "the Housing of the Poor" at the Church House, Westminster, on Wednesday, June 7th, at 3 p.m., under the auspices of the Church of England Sanitary Association. Sir F. G. Milner, Bart. M.P., will preside.

THE fifteenth annual meeting of the Church of England Burial, Funeral and Mourning Reform Association will be held at the Church House, Westminster, on Wednesday, June 7th, at 4 p.m. Sir F. G. Milner, Bart., M.P., will preside.

THE Rev. Arthur Herbert Powell, the new vicar of the important living of St. John's, Waterloo-road, whose appointment has been already announced, is one of the band of singularly able curates which Canon Erskine Clarke, Vicar of Battersea, has collected around him. Mr. Powell's past career has been rich in valuable experience. At Battersea, where he has been in charge of the district of St. Luke, which is practically a parish within a parish, he has completed a handsome church, and so thoroughly organised the district that the work of the church in all its numerous departments is in a flourishing and healthy condition. At St. John's some aspects of his work will be familiar from past experience.

A MEETING of officers in connection with the forthcoming Church Congress at Birmingham was held on the 24th ult., under the presidency of the Bishop of Worcester. The programme is approaching completion. The mayor will welcome the Congress at the Council-house on Tuesday morning, October 3rd; opening services will be held at 11.30, and the presidential address will be delivered in the Congress-hall at 2.30 the same afternoon. Among those who have already promised to take part in the Congress are the Archbishops of Canterbury, York, and Dublin; the Bishops of Durham, Chester, Derry, Edinburgh, Lichfield, Peterborough, Wakefield, Hull, and Bishop Bickersteth, of Japan; Viscount Halifax; the Deans of Armagh, Bristol, Lichfield, Lincoln, Norwich, and Worcester; Chancellor Espin; Archdeacons Farrar, Perowne, and Wilson; Sir C. Euan-Smith; Professors Sir George Stokes, Bonney, and Stokes (Dublin); Canons Bowers, Quirk, Jacob, Newbolt, and Allan Smith; Prebendary Webb-Peploe; the Revs. Charles Gore, Arthur Hall, Brooke Lambert, Handley Moule, E. Hoskyns, and Foster Pegg; and Messrs. Stanley Leighton, M.P., Gilbert Child, G. A. Spottiswoode, P. V. Smith, J. T. Bunce, Stafford Howard, and W. S. de Winton.

PREFERMENTS AND APPOINTMENTS.

Arkwright, Rev. Hubert Seymour, B.A.; Perpetual Curate of St. George's, Nottingham.

Astley, Rev. John Henry, M.A.; Curate-in-Charge of the New Ecclesiastical District of St. Paul's, Colwyn Bay.

Borthwick, Rev. E. R.; Chaplain and Naval Instructor to the *Volage*.

Carpenter, Rev. Edward Stanley, M.A.; Licensed to Officiate in the Diocese of Lichfield.

Clarke, Rev. C. Maurice, M.A., Curate of Christ Church, Southport; Senior Curate of St. Helen's Parish Church, with Charge of the York-street Conventional District.

Cole, Rev. William John, M.A., Curate of Christ Church; Vicar of St. James's, Toxteth-park, Liverpool.

Davies, Rev. Llewellyn Howard; Vicar of Steeple Claydon, Buckinghamshire.

Eliot, Rev. W., Vicar of Holy Trinity, Bournemouth, and Hon. Canon of Worcester Cathedral; Rural Dean of Christchurch.

Evans, Rev. John Williams, M.A., Vicar of St. Mellons and Rural Dean of Newport; Rector of Michaelstone-y-Vedw Cardiff.

Farrar, Rev. H. W., Chaplain to Missions to Seamen, South Shields; Vicar of St. James s, Carlisle.
Finch, Rev. Arthur Thomas, M.A.; Vicar of Bramhope, Leeds.
Godfray, Rev. Charles Moise, M.A.; Vicar of St. Simon s, Jersey.
Gower, Rev. David, Curate: Vicar of Penmaen, Newport.
Hill, Rev. Stephen, M.A., Curate of Blackburn; Rector of St. Mary's, West Horsley, Leatherhead.
Hitchcock, Rev. H. W.; Curate of St. Ethelburga's, Bishopsgate.
Hoggins, Rev. Cecil Richard; Perpetual Curate of Carnmenellis, Cornwall.
Jennings, Rev. Henry Richard, B.A.; Licensed Public Preacher in the Diocese of Truro.
Johns, Rev. Bennet George; Rector of All Cannings-with-Etchilhampton, Wilts.
Jones, Rev. William Davies, Vicar of Llanellan, Abergavenny; Chaplain of the Asylum at Abergavenny.
Lancelot, Rev. John Bennett, M.A.; Head Master of King's School, Rochester.
Lyon, Rev. Gilbert, Jun., M.A.; Vicar of Cloford, Frome.
Martin, Rev. George, M.A.; Rector of St. Michael's Caerhayes, St. Austell.
Master, Rev. Francis C., Vicar of Christ Church, Bootle; Vicar of Highworth-with-Sevenhampton, Wilts.
Miles, Rev. George, Curate of St. Wilfred's, Newcastle; Incumbent of St. Augustine's, Elswick.
Moriarty, Rev. James H., Chaplain and Naval Instructor to the *Boscawen*.
Noyes, Rev. John Percy, M.A.; Rector of All Hallows, Bromley-by-Bow.
Palmer, Rev. Gerard W., M.A., Curate of the Parish Church, Monmouth; to the Charge of St. Ann's, Higher Buxton.
Parker, Rev. Arthur H. Neville. Curate of St. Matthew's, Burnley; Vicar of Esholt, Yorkshire.
Parry, Rev. John, M.A., Vicar of St. Stephen's, Canonbury; Vicar of Bromley-by-Bow.
Rowbotham, Rev. John F.; Vicar of Ratley.
Rumfitt, Rev. Charles, B.A.; Licensed to Officiate in the Diocese of Lichfield.
Shawfield, Rev. Edwin Charles; Vicar of South Scarle-with-Girton and Besthorpe, Notts.
Smyth, Rev. Arthur Worsley, M.A.; Vicar of Little Abington and Vicar of Great Abington, Cambridge (by dispensation).
Torry, Rev. Alfred Freer, M.A., Rector of Marwood; Rector of Marston Mortain, Bedfordshire.
Twining, Rev. John Harrington, M.A.; Vicar of Wilsford and Woodford-cum-Lake, Wilts.
Ward, Rev. Charles Fenwick, M.A., Curate of Christ Church, Chadderton; Association Secretary of the Church Pastoral Aid Society for the North-western District.
Wilkinson, Rev. John Herbert, M.A.; Perpetual Curate of Caundle Stourton, Dorset.

CLERICAL OBITUARY.

Coghlan, Rev. John Armstrong, M.A., late Vicar of Tetsworth, at 3 Carlton-crescent, Southampton, on the 24th ult.
Dunn, Rev. Thomas, M.A., at the Vicarage, Burton, Chester, on the 23rd ult., aged 60.
Foster, William, M.A., of Clement's-inn, Strand, and Lecturer on Chemistry at the Middlesex Hospital, on the 23rd ult., aged 47.
Head, Rev. George, for forty-six years Rector, at Aston Somerville Rectory, on the 20th ult., aged 70.
Hoskyns, Rev. Charles Henry William, at Holywell Rectory, St. Ives, on the 21st ult., aged 57.
Lewthwaite, Rev. George, at Adel, Yorks, on Whitsun Monday, aged 75.
Pitt, Rev. Joseph, of Torquay, for many years Rector of Rendcomb, at Buxton, on the 22nd ult., aged 74.
Smith, Rev. Thomas, formerly Vicar of St. John's, Harborne, at Holmwood, Weston-super-Mare, on the 26th ult., aged 76.
Thomas, Rev. David Rice, at Long Marston, on the 26th ult., aged 36.
Tomling, Rev. Thomas, twenty-four years Incumbent of Egton-cum-Newland, and late of Coniston, at Egton Vicarage, Ulverston, on the 25th ult., aged 88.
Tuson, Rev. Henry, Retired Indian Chaplain, at St. James's Rectory, Halesworth, Suffolk, on the 23rd ult.

FIRST REMOVE THE CAUSE.

MEN frequently worry and trouble themselves a great deal in trying to cure the symptoms of vital weakness, nervous exhaustion, and kindred ailments, instead of endeavouring to first remove the cause. This can be done by Mr. Harness' Electropathic Treatment without the aid of drugs. It is useless to tell sufferers to employ their minds and bodies in useful work and to forget their disorders, so long as the cause of their troubles is not removed. How can it be expected that when they are fatigued by the least exertion they can occupy themselves by studying, walking, or other exercise? Even in conversation they frequently lose the thread of it and repeatedly find their memory failing them. What can they do? Physic will not cure them—perhaps the leading physicians have failed to afford them any relief, and they have consequently become hopeless. It is to such as these that Mr. Harness' new combined Electropathic Belt and Suspensory is so strongly recommended, as, by its gentle but continuous action, invigorating electric currents are imperceptibly generated and conveyed direct from the spinal cord to the affected parts. It is this scientifically constructed and convenient appliance which silently but surely acts upon the vital organs, and removes the cause of the patient's disease, effecting wonderful change in his health, character, and conduct, and speedily enabling him to return to his natural tastes and habits, and enjoy once more the full vigour of youth, with all its accompanying pleasures.

We may add that this perfect Electro-medical appliance is exceedingly comfortable to wear, gives wonderful support and vitality to all the internal organs of the body, prevents chills, imparts new life and vigour to the debilitated constitution, stimulates the organic action, promotes the circulation, assists digestion, and promptly renews that vital energy, the loss of which is the first symptom of decay. Its healing properties are multifarious. It stimulates the functions of various organs, increases their secretions, gives tone to muscle and nerves, relaxes morbid contractions, improves nutrition, and effectually renews exhausted nerve force. Acting directly on the system, it sustains and assists its various functions, and thus promotes the health and vigour of the entire frame. Besides these benefits, the mind is maintained in a buoyant, cheerful state, and every faculty is stimulated to the highest condition of intellectual strength.

Gentlemen who read the above announcement have only to visit London and call at the Electropathic and Zander Institute (52, Oxford Street, W.) to be convinced of the marvellous curative powers of Electricity and Mr. Harness' perfect methods of imperceptibly applying the current. The medical officers of the establishment are in daily attendance, and may be consulted free of charge either personally or by letter.

The Church of England Pulpit.

THE UNITY OF LIFE IN CHRIST.

By the Rev. J. ARMITAGE ROBINSON, B.D., Fellow of Christ's College, and Norrisian Professor of Divinity.

Sermon Preached before the University of Cambridge, on Sunday, May 7th, 1893.

"Without Me ye can do nothing."—St. John xv. 5.

WHATEVER speaks of combination and co-operation has an attractive sound for modern ears. The progress of civilised life has been one steady march in the direction of combining and of unifying; increasing by co-operation the efficiency of the whole, but at the necessary cost of the separate completeness of the part. Division of labour has meant more work done, but fewer all-round workers; specialisation of study—the particular application of the general principle which touches us most nearly in this place—has issued in a vast increase of knowledge, and for most men a proportionate limitation of the subjects which in any worthy sense they can hope to know. Faculties have even atrophied for want of use; men who in former times would have been strong on many sides are strong now only on one. "The individual lessens." We are beset more than ever with limitations; we are even in danger of depreciating what we cannot hope to master, of exalting our own province at the expense of others, of losing sympathy with other workers; in a word, of narrowness of interest, of unworthy jealousy.

And yet we cannot doubt that we are advancing all along the line, moving forward with a stride more rapid than human history has ever known before. We are gaining by our very loss. "The individual lessens, but the world is more and more."

The whole is advancing at the cost of the parts. Such is the witness of facts as we see them in the lives of others, and experience them somewhat sadly in our own. This is the Vision of Life that grows clearer and clearer before our imagination: a baffling, perturbing dream—what is the interpretation of it?

Have we cheated ourselves in our belief in the sacredness and worth of individual lives? Is the individual to be nothing after all? Or is it that our conception of the perfection of the individual has been a faulty one and needs correction? Have we been claiming for him more than his rights in asking independence, self-sufficiency, the separate roundness of a perfect whole? Can it be that, after all, the individual is not the Man, but merely an integral part of the true Man?

Is the true Man that larger whole which is the organised totality of all the parts? Is it this that is creation's final goal? Is the consummation of all things to consist, not in a mere addition sum of millions of monotonously perfect units, but rather in the developed perfectness of one Perfect Man, made up of countless individual men, who have reached their ultimate attainment in that limited perfection which is the perfect adaptation of a part to the performance of its function as a part, not as a separate and independent whole?

The truth that all men are but one man may justly be said to be the peculiar revelation of Christianity, and in some sense its most characteristic revelation.

The chief exponent of this truth is certainly St. Paul. To him it was the truth of truths, the central message of the Gospel committed to his trust. In his early days he was by nationality and education the apostle of exclusiveness, of distinctive Jewish privilege—a strange prelude to the life which was to claim the world for Christ. In his great moment of transition he was taught a lesson which he never could forget—the revelation of a new bond of union which related man to One who was a man—that Jesus of Nazareth stood in an unheard-of closeness of relation to those who had thrown in their lot with Him and had been baptised into His name. To lay hands on them was to lay hands on Him, for He and they were one: "Saul, Saul, why persecutest thou Me?" The sight of the Risen Lord, and the revelation of His transcendent oneness with those who represented His cause and carried on His work, set all things in a new light to this earnest soul; and when he bowed his will in unreserved submission, and asked what henceforth he must do, the answer came at once that he should bear Christ's name to the Gentiles.

It was long before events were ripe, and he himself was duly fitted to carry out the commission thus given him, and to wear the mantle of the martyred Stephen as the prophet of the wider hope. But he was not disobedient to the heavenly vision, and he lived to proclaim in Jewish synagogues, in Gentile schools, in Apostolic conference, and "in writing to remain to posterity," his own first and last and only Gospel—that God had made of one all nations upon the earth; that God in Christ was reconciling a world unto Himself; that "there can be neither Jew nor Greek, there can be neither bond nor free, there can be no male and female; for all of you are one—one man—in Christ Jesus."

Everywhere and always the same truth breaks forth in his writings, or lies close beneath the surface. His whole fabric of theology is built up on this as its foundation; his conception of atonement

and redemption everywhere implies it as the eternal and essential idea; his hope for the future of mankind consists in its ultimate realisation. In the most sacred relations of human life he finds its God-given types and pledges. The oneness of the married state was intended to prefigure it. This mystery is great, but he speaks it of Christ and of the Church; they are not twain, but one. "No man ever hated his own flesh, but nourisheth and cherisheth it; even as Christ also doth the Church, for we are limbs of His body."

This truth of the organic vital unity of men was to him the divinely revealed principle of the constitution of Society, as it renewed its youth in the first Christian communities. To false-tongued Greeks in Asia he appealed for the social virtue of veracity on the ground of the One Body: "Put away falsehood; speak the truth each with his neighbour; for we are limbs one of another." To the quarrelling Corinthians he expounded at once their folly and their sin. They were rending the Body, they were dividing Christ. "Is Christ divided?" "There must be no rent in the Body." And to confront their differences and their distractions he developed his great metaphor with a felicity unparalleled before or since: "As the Body is one and hath many members, and all the members of the Body being many are one Body, so also is Christ: for by one Spirit were we all baptised into one Body. . . . . For the Body also is not one member, but many. If the Foot should say, Because I am not a Hand, I am not of the Body, it is not therefore not of the Body; and if the Ear should say, Because I am not an Eye, I am not of the Body, it is not therefore not of the Body. If all the Body were an Eye, where were the hearing? If all were hearing, where were the smelling? But now God hath set the members, each one of them in the Body as it hath pleased Him. And if all were one member, where were the Body? But now there are many members, but one Body. The Eye cannot say to the Hand, I have no need of thee; or again the Head to the Feet, I have no need of you. . . . . God hath tempered the Body together, giving more abundant honour to that which lacketh, that there may be no schism in the Body, but that the members may have the same care one for the other. And whether one member suffer, all the members suffer with it; or one member be glorified, all the members rejoice with it. Now ye are the Body of Christ, and members in particular."

So attractive is the brilliant rhetoric with which St. Paul draws out his conception of the body and its members, and so readily does the metaphor lend itself to a practical application to common social needs, that at times we are inclined to contrast with it unfavourably the image from still life which Christ Himself adopts to figure forth His relation to all who belong to Him.

Yet we do well to remind ourselves that, whatever element of truth may underlie the assertion that Christianity, as a system of thought, is the product of the mind of St. Paul, yet here at least, in his fundamental conception, he has no claim to be original. The development of the metaphor in which he loved to express the great thought of the unity of all human life was wholly his own; but the thought itself was given him by his Master.

By a single phrase, whereby Christ chose again and again to describe Himself in His earthly life, He had launched the great idea, and at the same time had claimed to be not merely its exponent, but the pledge in His own person of its realisation. When He took as His chosen title the name of the "Son of Man," He thereby set up such a claim as stands and must ever stand alone in human history —a proof itself (if proof were needed now) of the entire uniqueness of the personality which could dare to make the claim. For He claimed to be in a unique relationship—a relationship as yet, indeed, left wholly undefined—to every human being. And this startling, uninterpreted expression, which meets us so often in the pages of the synoptic Gospels, finds its meaning expounded and developed in the most striking parable of the Fourth Gospel:

"I am the true Vine, and My Father is the Husbandman: every branch in Me that beareth not fruit, He taketh it away; and every branch that beareth fruit, He purgeth it that it may bear more fruit. . . . . Abide in Me, and I in you. As the branch cannot bear fruit of itself except it abide in the Vine, so neither can ye, except ye abide in Me. I am the Vine, ye are the branches. He that abideth in Me and I in him, the same beareth much fruit; for without Me—apart from Me—ye can do nothing."

Not, perhaps, so human a picture—not so powerful and practical as a working metaphor for the regulation of society; and yet, when we examine it, possessing one element which renders it more marvellously adapted to its purpose than the more attractive image of St. Paul.

To St. Paul's thought we are the Body, fitly framed together and compacted by that which every joint supplieth, growing up into Christ, who is the Head. To the completeness of the Body and the performance of its common tasks every limb is necessary. This man lends an eye; that man lends a hand, and another a foot; and so the joint result achieved is far more than the sum of the efficiencies of individual parts. "Ye are one Body and severally members thereof," and "the Head of every man is Christ."

But, after all, the whole of the truth is not expressed. Christ is more to us than the Head is to the Body; and St. Paul himself knows this, and now and again in a strange blending of his metaphors he speaks of the whole Body, Head and limbs together, as "the Christ," and he tells us that the Church is not only His Body, but "the Fulness of Him who filleth all in all."

The parable of Christ escapes this imperfection,

and by a natural image supplies the deficiency: "I am the vine, ye are branches of the vine." Not, as we too often seem to read it, "I am the stock of the vine, and ye are the branches that grow out of the stock;' but "I am the vine; I am the tree, ye are branches of the tree; I am the whole, ye are the parts which make up the whole."

Again and again, as we read the Gospels, we are confronted by that miracle which of all miracles is the most impressive to the student of history and literature—a miracle which encourages our faith as much as other miracles have proved its stumbling-blocks in these later days—the marvellous originality and uniqueness of the person and utterances of Jesus Christ. With all their divergencies and discrepancies, the first three Gospels agree in the presentation of a single and consistent character, asserting enormous claims, and acting as we should demand that it should act supposing those claims to be true. If His words are recorded differently by different writers, if the incidents of His life take a different colouring and appear in different contexts, the very diversity serves only to emphasise the unity of the whole conception. And when we turn to the Fourth Gospel, and the scenes are wholly changed, and the picture is set in a new historical frame, yet it is the same character which manifests itself in fresh surroundings, with the same self-consciousness and the same self-renunciation, showing the same tenderness and the same severity, making the same astonishing claims, though in wholly different language and to wholly different listeners.

The records are as different as we could possibly conceive them, but they are dealing with the same living personality. It is the same Christ; other eyes have seen Him, other hands have handled Him; that is all. No theory of a literary invention, even if we could find a historical time and place for its production, could long satisfy a thoughtful mind. Nothing but the actual truth of His actions and His claims—marvellous as both alike must ever remain—can account for the existence of these records of His life.

If the Fourth Gospel has presented and still presents the most serious literary difficulties, yet on the other hand it is this Gospel that impresses the reader most deeply with the divineness of the utterances which it records. How many a distressed enquirer after the truth has at times found every Book of Scripture closed as it were against him, and has turned in the earnestness of despair to the xivth, xvth, xvith, and xviith chapters of St. John, certain that there at least something above him and beyond him, something more than human, something of another world, is speaking to him—speaking in tones that silence his misgivings and reassure his faith, and, as he has read on, has experienced in himself, as Origen * says, a vestige of inspiration—παθὼν ἐξ αὐτοῦ τοῦ ἀναγινώσκειν ἴχνος ἐνθουσιασμοῦ.

And of all that great and inspiring section no part is more calculated to arrest our attention and convince us of the divineness of the Speaker than the words in which Christ claims to be the Vine of Humanity.

What teacher ever addressed such words to his pupils? "You and I," He says, "are linked together by more than the closest bonds of human teaching and discipleship. We are One. As the branches are one with the Tree, so that they cannot be without it, nor it without them; so you are one with Me, and I am one with you."

What consequences flow from such a relationship? It follows that in some mysterious way even Christ Himself is incomplete without us. For there is no tree without its branches, no whole without its parts. "The Church . . . is the fulness of Him." And still more obviously it follows that the disciple cannot live his life at all without his Master. "Without Me ye can do nothing."

I have used the metaphors of St. Paul and of Christ Himself in their broadest application. I have spoken of the whole of mankind as the Body of which Christ is the Head, I have spoken of the Vine of Humanity. I claim to do so, because Christ called Himself "the Son of Man." But if every human being is by his very creation and constitution so related to Christ, whether as yet he knows it or not, or whether he believes it or not—what then was the Apostolic band to whom Christ's words were immediately addressed? What is the Church which St. Paul says is Christ's Body?

I would answer this important question shortly thus. The Apostles were the little group of human souls to whom was entrusted the first revelation of the great human truth, with the duty of preserving and proclaiming it. The Church is the nucleus of that regenerated human society which is to grow out of the recognition and realisation of the true human constitution.

God works slowly as in eternity, and God works within a defined but expanding sphere of operation. We are only at the beginning yet after centuries have gone by.

The new Church of the Apostolic days sprang forward instantly to claim individual men and women and pledge them by her sacraments of unity to live the ideal life of common work and mutual helpfulness, and in the early strength of her enthusiasm promised shortly to fulfil her destiny and absorb the vast humanity that lay about her. The end seemed near, but before the Apostolic age had closed the vision shifted into the further future; and we who can look backwards now as they looked forwards can see that "the end is not by and by."

But let us not mistrust the truth of their early vision. The Church has lost sight of it too often, and has thereby failed to understand her mission and her hope. She has mistaken the present

* *De Principiis* iv. 6.

necessities of exclusiveness and limitation—which are the very conditions of a strong and effective society—for eternal barriers set up between man and man. She has lost sight of her ultimate purpose of universal inclusion. She has allowed whole provinces of human life to remain outside her sphere of action, confining herself too much to the distinctively religious needs and aspirations, instead of claiming every energy of life, every advance of knowledge, as a part of her inheritance. She has thought of herself as the favourite of Christ rather than as One with Christ; and so she has looked out on men with other eyes than His, and has despaired of the great world instead of saving it. She has wondered at goodness outside her own bounds, and sometimes has dared to deny it, instead of recognising all goodness in all men as a fresh pledge that they are Christ's and must be claimed for Him.

We of to-day insist upon the assertion that Theology is a Science; its methods are in turn the methods of philosophy and history and social science. The older thinkers were perhaps more near the truth in claiming that it is the Science of the Sciences, the interpreter and harmoniser of them all. It is vain for us to say that now, unless we are prepared to live and act accordingly, to welcome every fresh advance of knowledge as a divine light given to men, patiently to stand by ourselves if need be that other workers may press on the faster, religiously to aid their efforts by smoothing as we may their course and letting all men see that their cause is our cause; that we stand as witnesses, in the midst of all variety of knowledge and discoveries, that each is complementary to the other, that all are essential to the progress of the whole, that eye and hand and foot and all the rest are but one Man.

So, too, shall we preach a word of solid comfort when a worker is struck down in the midst of his busiest employment and when he seems about to achieve some new result. The worker passes, but the work remains; other hands will take it up and carry it further forward still for the common good. Nothing is lost; not the work; nor the worker, though he goes elsewhere. He is still a branch—a fruit-bearing branch—of the eternal Vine. He shares in Its life now as before, and when at last in the great consummation It shall be manifested in Its completed glory, he will be there in his place; no results attained here without their eternal value there, no faculty trained here without its eternal purpose there.

If we could grasp more adequately and more tenaciously this transcendent view of life, we should do our work more calmly and with greater strength. For our common life in this place illustrates all that has been said to-day. We are set here in the forefront of intellectual progress, and wherever life is keenest, there its contradictions are most felt and clamour most persistently for some interpretation.

It is hard indeed for the younger men amongst us to grasp the elements of the problem. A multitude of interests distract attention from serious thinking. And the dominant influence of competition—valuable as indeed it is as a stimulus to the acquisition of knowledge—deadens the desire of knowledge for its own sake. When Henry More came up to Christ's two centuries and a half ago, his tutor's first question to him was with what object had he come. He briefly answered, "That I may know"; and when further pressed for the reason of this thirst for knowledge, the only answer he could find was in the same words, "That I may know."

To-day too often the honest answer would have to be, "That I may get—get something by my knowledge"; "honour," perhaps — "income" perhaps—something less at any rate than the pure joy of knowing truth.

In its baser forms of result we see this tendency closing the very avenues of independent thought to our younger students. A man even checks his natural instinct of enquiry, lest it lead him into subjects which, in the gross phrase, "will not pay." I do not say that in the long run a man may not be the gainer by his concentration and his limitation. The course he is asked to run is the best course that wisdom and experience has been able to mark out for him. But it is the spirit of narrowness against which I would warn you. Competition may be a necessary condition of our general advance; but it is a temporary condition only, needed now to urge our energies, which are not sufficiently under our control to work with the same eagerness for the joy that comes of common work and joint result.

But you live in the midst of co-operating workers here, as well as of rival competitors, and you have the opportunity of forming the nobler ideal. You may watch men who labour night and day for no selfish ends, but for the increase of the common store of knowledge—toiling incessantly to push back, however little, the barriers of human ignorance and extend the frontiers of the known and knowable; each working humbly and patiently at some obscure point which you cannot as yet even appreciate—in the hope, not that he himself will clear the whole mystery, but that his work may secure some new and firm standing-ground from which another, after he is gone, may take a step forward into what is now unknown.

One such noble, gentle, patient worker has just left us.* Most of you could know nothing of him personally, but he moved quietly, unassumingly, in and out among us, doing his work as incessantly as if his moments were all counted, and yet as unhurriedly as if he were to work for ever here—a

* The late Professor Bensby, Lord Almoner's Reader in Arabic, who died very suddenly, shortly after his return from Mount Sinai, where he had been engaged in deciphering the newly discovered Syriac manuscript of the Gospels.

beautiful example of the refining influence on character of genuine scholarship and zeal for truth. In an instant he has dropped his work, when his hands were most full, and when new work had been placed in them which he of all men seemed most competent to do. No man ever left his work more obviously incomplete: and yet we believe he did the work he was meant to do, and he has trained others to take it up and carry it forward in their turn. Let his memory teach us afresh the incompleteness of the individual if he stands alone, and the value of the individual life that has recognised and done its share for the common cause.

Let me sum up in a few words, and I have done. We have faced the problem of life as it presents itself to earnest minds at the present day, we have seen that the completeness of the whole is being achieved at the cost of the completeness of the parts. But we have learned that the Christian revelation has anticipated our distress as individuals on finding more than ever as the centuries pass that one man cannot be all, and has told us by way of reassurance that all are and shall be One. And so a new light dawns on the meaning and the destiny of the individual life; its perfection is not the rounded completeness of the whole, but the perfect adaptation of the part to its place in the whole. The Incarnation, when "God took Man upon Himself to deliver him"—*Tu ad liberandum suscepisti hominem*—is the anticipation of type in the long series of development, the pledge of the final consummation. Christ is One with the Race, which finds its unity and attains its goal in Him. He is the Whole of which we are the parts, the Tree of which we are the branches. We shall know our place and fulfil our function in proportion as we learn to recognise our oneness with Him and our dependence upon Him. No separate, self-regarding, independent life can be ours; if we are to bear fruit it can only be as we abide in Him and He in us. As we bow before Him and confess the selfishness and separateness of our past lives and ask, "Lord, what henceforth wilt Thou have me to do?" the answer will be given to each of us in varying forms according to our special powers; but for all alike one command will be the same: "Abide in Me, and I in you: for without Me ye can do nothing."

CANON HENRY REES has resigned the living of Conway, through ill health.

THE first of the Polytechnic Trips for the World's Fair, at Chicago, arrived in New York on Friday afternoon, May 12th. These trips will be continued every week up to August 5th. The parties travel by the Guion Line from Liverpool every fortnight, and from Southampton every Friday and Saturday by the Inman and Hamburg-American Lines. A few vacancies still remain. Full detailed prospectus can be obtained on application to the Secretary, the Polytechnic, 309, Regent-street, London, W.

HUMAN AFFLICTION DIVINELY SHARED.

BY THE REV. M. B. HOGG, B.A.

SERMON PREACHED IN KEADY PARISH CHURCH, ON SUNDAY, 26TH MARCH, 1893.

"In all their affliction He was afflicted, and the angel of His presence saved them: in His love and in His pity He redeemed them; and He bare them, and carried them all the days of old."—ISAIAH lxiii. 9.

TO remind you to-day that God is One who "feels," as we might say, for those He has created and placed in this sphere of duty and probation, might seem to some a mere waste of time, a mere pulpit platitude. But notwithstanding its well-worn covering of phraseology the expression is true, and has vast layers of underlying truth beneath its surface.

And it is desirable that we should be reminded of this cheering fact that God can feel, with infinitely greater keenness and sharpness, than we, in these days of "compulsory isolation" of the personality of God, are willing to allow. For you are taught in modern theology that God is scarce a person at all; or if, indeed, the term Person be allowed, that He is a Being of passionless existence, a sort of etherealised isolation, calmly acquiescent in the sorrow, indifferently interested in the welfare of His creatures, who approach Him, not with love, but as one to be worshipped and contemplated afar off.

And the definitions of the schools do not help us to understand God better. It does not comfort the bleeding heart of the widow to be told that God, as our first Article has it, is a Being of infinite power and wisdom, everlasting, without body, etc. It cannot help the puzzled inquirer much to learn that predestination is a wholesome and salutary doctrine, which it were well he could swallow and assimilate. It cannot hugely help the erring prodigal to forsake the swinish husks of the stranger for the fatted calf of the parental household to have it put to his head, as a musket fully charged, that such and such things comprise the Catholic faith, without acceptance of which he will, no doubt, perish everlastingly. The "God of our fathers" is a phrase very "trim," very historic, very soul-stirring. But what kind of God did our fathers believe in? Rather let us ask, What conception of God obtained in those ages? Well, I will tell you—a God not of tenderness, but of wrath; a God not of love, but of vengeance; a God not of sympathy, but of slaughter. And yet, had they read their Prayer-books aright, in those far-distant, long-forgotten, and dreary days that are over, they would have discovered—as we, I trust, have discovered for ourselves—that the compilers of our Liturgy were but the transcribers of the indelible and deathless sentiments of mediæval and apostolic saints, who possessed broader, grander views of God's sovereignty and love than did our fathers, for

these only knew Him as a Torturer, and not a Father —as a Judge, not a Saviour. Hear the beautiful, pathetic Collect for this day, and tell me, can you fail to discover the true character of Jehovah? "Almighty God, who of Thy tender love towards mankind," etc.

Here you find the best thought of all the ages compressed into a few brief lines, a thought nobly expressed by David long ages before, "that like as a father pitieth His own," etc.—a thought that helps us to remember that the God we know and love is a kind, infinitely compassionate, actively beneficent Being, who feels the tenderest love and is stirred by the profoundest emotions of pure and holy affection for the frail creatures He made and endowed with responsive reciprocal capacities.

One misconception of God, indeed, ought speedily to be removed even from the densest intellect here to-day—a misconception which, in some degree, clings to minds that clearly apprehend that God is a Spirit, and they that worship Him must worship Him in Spirit and in truth—and that is the notion that God, as God, is in any degree human or physical, or even psychical, if by that term we understand the higher part of man as distinguished from the animal. I have often heard—so, no doubt, have you—persons speak of God as the "Good Man," the "Man above us," and so on. "God is not a man that He should lie, or the son of man that He should repent," said the Arabian wizard Balaam, whose weird isolation, no doubt, amid Eastern scenes and surroundings, brought him into vivid contact with the Infinite. Any man who lives apart, either in city or in country, and communes with the better, higher, nobler principles within him, will inevitably receive a revelation or apocalypse of his own, which, if divinely controlled, will lead him to God and ultimately save his soul. Always remember that God cannot be physically affected. If He suffers, the suffering is not bodily. Our very deepest, subtlest feeling, those of joy or sorrow, for instance, come not from the body, but from the mind, and are affected unerringly by the relation we stand in towards others. And when we say, as in our text it is written, that in all our afflictions He is afflicted, we assert that God feels for us really, but spiritually—keenly, but morally; and that affliction is duly and accurately proportioned to every individual case in this broad and measureless universe.

The fact is, when human attributes, such as hands, voice, wrath, life, shape or being, all physical qualities, as applied to God, it is only on the theory of "adaptation." God has not hands, as we understand it. "A spirit," saith Jesus, "hath not flesh and bones as you see Me have." He reveals Himself to man, as a man, simply because man could not take in the revelation in any other way. A lion, for instance, or a tiger, could not be made to understand a thing by trying to picture matter to his lower intelligence from man's standpoint of feeling; but show him a lion or a tiger in pain, or in enjoyment, or in danger, and then his intelligence, such as it is, will grasp it. So God, knowing our frame, and remembering that we are but dust, revealed Himself to us as a man, and we have been enabled to apprehend Him accordingly. And then, in order that man might know Him fully, or, perhaps, in order that He might know man more fully, who shall say—the Bible, in the main, is silent on this latter point—He sent forth His Son, made of a woman, made under the law, to redeem us. But if it were in order to know us more accurately and intimately, I think we may well marvel at the gracious condescension and loving care of this Infinite Being of all love and all goodness. For not unreasonably we might ask ourselves, "What qualities exist in us to render us objects of such love to God?" Are we of such huge importance to any one that He, a Being of a loftier nature, of a purer, holier essence than ours, should so covet our acquaintance, and so passionately desire to find out by practical experience all about us and all that concerns us? Certain it is that the revelation He imparted to us in Jesus tells us distinctly that He loves us actively. The Collect, you see, speaks of it as "tender love"; and as this Collect is an old Latin prayer, taken from the Sarum Missal, much anterior to the Reformation, we may assume that even the ancient Anglo-Saxon Christians had broader and better views of God's love and tenderness than the gloomy Puritan or the rigid Calvinist of a more enlightened, but less religious and spiritual age.

For it is an eternal truth, and truth is ever old and never new, that the Word became flesh, etc., simply because of His love and tenderness, only because of His pity.

And so we naturally reach the full meaning of our text: "In all our afflictions—He," that is, God—"was afflicted."

You will have observed that there is an undoubted connection between the services of to-day and the leading idea of this sermon—viz., God's fellow-feeling of pity and sympathy with man. I have selected this topic specially, because you will all agree with me that what we have heard and read this morning all enforce and educe it, and the particular manner in which we are to-day invited to contemplate these attributes of the Father is in the life and death of the eternal Son, the Man Christ Jesus. Admittedly it is of Him this special mention is made in our text; "the angel and messenger of His presence, saved them;" and very much indeed is told us on this solemn occasion of that wondrous Being, that strange mystic personality, who came as a lonely stranger to His own though His own received Him not, but who gave eternal life to as many as received and believed on Him; an eternal life, which, from the very nature of the case, could never be lost or squandered.

What a Man he was, my brothers, for humanity to imitate! What a noble, chivalrous, pure and stainless Name was that which Jesus bore! A Name which is indeed above every name. A Name in the spell and witchery of which every knee shall bow to Jehovah; and every tongue shall confess that Jesus Christ is Lord, to the glory of God the Father.

The historic Jesus is a Being whose life and work are beyond suspicion of exaggeration; even on that low ground He stands before us to-day as the noblest Man that ever lived, as the tenderest, truest Heart that ever beat in mortal frame. But contemplate Him as the Church in her superb tragedy this morning throws out His Figure and presence on the boards, and see in the Man of Sorrows, in the grief-laden, careworn, heart-broken, footsore Nazarene, the Incarnation of the Mighty God, the Father of the everlasting age, the Reconciler of the sinner with his Maker, verily and indeed the Prince of Peace. Yes, there you may see at last the Incarnation of Divine sympathy, the apocalypse of eternal love, the concentration of all prophetic teaching, the Ideal of all law and offering and type and sacrifice.

O what a Being! O what a huge aggregate of human guilt and sin, and care and shame heaped high on His willing, devoted shoulders! For it is not a myth, not a gruesome Puritanic distortion, that He bare our sins in His own Body, etc., and "that by His stripes we are healed," but a fact true as God and lofty in its significance as heaven.

This Man to-day appeals to us all in His lowly birth, in His glorious, self-sacrificing life. In His wondrous shameful death you hear the calm rejoinder to the question of querulous irresolution: "I am a King, but My kingdom is not from hence." You hear the howling menacing mob that but yesterday cheered Him to the echo, "Not this man, but Barabbas." You see the dignified authoritative personality that bears meekly the blow of the High Priest's underling. You gaze on the judgment-hall and take in at a rapid mental glance the details of the tragic scene. You behold the funeral procession, you witness in spirit the ignominious death. Your senses are stunned with the rude shock of the earthquake, and your spirit quakes at the portents you see so plainly visible in the murky, bloody sky, and if you do not believe on Him as the only possible Saviour of the race, and accept Him as your Leader for evermore, I am commissioned to tell you "that there remaineth no other sacrifice for sins, but a certain fearful looking for of judgment."

And now to give this text a practical and individual turn. It is meant for all of us, and its scope is indicated by its sweeping comprehensive declaration, "In all their afflictions He was afflicted." Learn we chiefly the lesson of positive, direct, and absolute salvation from destruction effected for mankind by the "angel of His presence," for, doubtless, the entire passage is a strictly Messianic one, referring indubitably to Him who, as in the first verse, is pictured as coming from Edom with dyed garments, etc, You may take it no doubt in its literal sense as applying to a temporal victory achieved by God for His people, but its language is too special, is too far-reaching, is, in fact, too broad to be narrowed down to any past age, and to be debarred from approach to the Christian era by any arbitrary statute of critical limitation.

And Christ's salvation, as you are plainly assured in the vivid, thrilling tragedy enacted for you this morning, is perfect and entire, wanting nothing. But beware of the danger of hearing and learning and knowing familiarly the story of the Gospel, without taking it to yourselves and making it your own. That indeed would be very foreign to the spirit of the text. God was afflicted with you and shared your afflictions, and the angel of His presence saved you; in His love and in His pity He redeemed you, but not certainly against your inclinations, not without your being fully aware of it, not, in fact, without your own earnest co-operation. His death, His life, His work were not only intended to operate as a sacrifice for sins, but as a far more potent agency, an example of godly life. Do not stop short at the threshold. At the entrance, indeed, to all fields and departments of spiritual effort, stands the angel of His presence; but there is much work to be done by us ere we lay down the weary burden at eventide, when the western shadows are lengthened out and the tired labourer seeks repose. "To come to Christ," as men flippantly put it, is a nice phrase: "Beware, lest on your lips it be only a phrase after all." It has been known that men have gone down to their very graves cursed by a pious orthodoxy which was only knowlege, not faith, which was conviction of sin, not conversion of life. For such men the affliction was felt in vain, the sympathy was fruitless, and the angel of His presence had a thankless task.

Let the work of that mighty One, His great salvation, His eternal love, His matchless pity, only prompt you to holier living, and, as a consequence, holier dying.

But there is another view of this passage which is not without interest to us. You know that Hebrew is a very difficult language to render accurately and intelligibly, its meaning is so obscure. And so there isanother rendering of this verse which is given as alternative, and which may or not be adequate. It is this: "In all their afflictions He was no adversary." Now if that be the correct rendering, it is even more pathetic than the other. It tells us that He doth not willingly afflict; it assures us that in all we suffer there is no malevolence on God's part, and that we are guaranteed His sympathy and pity. In this world every individual soul stands solitary and alone. He may evoke love and fellow-feeling and kindness from

his fellows, but there is a point when all this must inexorably end, and there the sympathy of God comes in. "In all their afflictions He was no adversary," nay, rather He was afflicted. Why, because He understands you so well, knows what you are, sees and judges your capacity as no other can. What a Saviour to follow, what a Master to obey, what a Redeemer to love! Oh, shall we not in the best sense this morning yield ourselves up to and be led by His guidance, influenced by His example, charmed by His personality, warmed by His love; and shall we not endeavour to make our adoption of His work for us a living power for good, not a mere acknowledgment of His claim on our obedience. May we, then, not as a simple exclamation of admiring wonder but of rapturous faith, exclaim with the fervour of conviction and the stern reality of determination, "Truly this was the Son of God."

Two or three new books have appeared this week at Oxford. Mr. Robert Bridges publishes, at the Clarendon Press, an examination of the rules of blank verse in Milton's later poems, under the title of "Milton's Prosody." Mr. G. M'N. Rushforth is the author of a small volume of "Latin Historical Inscriptions," intended to illustrate the history of the Julio-Claudian Emperors, as Mr. Hicks's larger volume illustrates Greek history. The volume has, it appears, been revised by Professor Pelham and Mr. Haverfield, and may be taken as an interesting proof of the increase of archæological study in Oxford. Another work in which Oxford men feel a good deal of interest, Professor W. M. Ramsay's "Church in the Roman Empire," has received the signal and curious distinction of a gold medal from the Pope. In this context one may mention the announcements of two sets of lectures—one by Mr. Arthur Evans "on a Mycenæan treasure from Ægina" (June 3), the other by Mr. Rendel Harris on (1) methods of research in Eastern libraries; and (2) the origins of the Codices ℵ and B. These latter will be delivered at Mansfield College on June 5th and 6th at five o'clock.

Village Club Feast and the Landed Interest.—At the annual dinner of the Ancient Order of Shepherds at Westow, near York, last week, Major Dent presiding, the Rev. J. Lascelles, vice-chairman of the Yorkshire Union of Agricultural Clubs, proposed "Success to the landed interest." In reply, the Rev. F. Lawrence, vicar, read a letter from Lord Winchelsea, who urged the necessity of all three classes engaged in the agricultural industry to join in one great union, in which they all three would be fairly and equally represented, and contended that if the labourers joined it they would help to secure for themselves good wages and many other things besides, such as allotments, healthy cottages, good water, etc. In the morning, the Rev. A. Springett-Norfolk, Chaplain to the Forces at York, preached the annual sermon, in the course of which he said that the labour difficulty could be solved only by Christian teaching. Young men, for whom there was no other work, should emigrate or enlist. Soldiers were not looked down upon as soldiers. Bad soldiers were of course looked down upon, so were bad civilians. A truly respectable position, and then a pension, was the lot of one who served his country in the army faithfully.

NOTICES.

All communications respecting the Literary portion of the paper should be addressed to the Editor.

Business communications of every kind should be addressed to Dr. S. Gibbon, at the Church of England Pulpit Office, 160, Fleet Street, London, E.C., to whom cheques and Post-office orders for subscriptions (in advance), three months, 2s., six months, 3s. 6d., twelve months, 6s. 6d., are to be made payable.

The Cases for binding Vol. XXXIV. are now ready.

For Health and Immortality.

The Ecclesiastical Review.

SATURDAY, JUNE 10, 1893.

SENILE VANITY.

MR. GLADSTONE has begun to publish, for the admiration of the world, his school exercises as a boy at Eton (æt. 18), and the editor of a first-class magazine, the *Contemporary Review*, has given a place, among the wealth of serious and important papers which enrich his pages, to this exhibition of second-childish self-conceit! Surely Mr. Gladstone made an unpardonable omission when, among the profusion of honours that he distributed among his flatterers on the occasion of Her Majesty's birthday, he did not make this editor a baronet, or at least a knight. Perhaps he will discharge the debt he owes him on the next possible occasion. Meanwhile let us offer the editor a suggestion. Very possibly there may be preserved among the archives of the Gladstone family the first copy-book that the future Premier ever wrote. Might not that editor embellish his review with a lithograph facsimile of that interesting document? It is impossible that so great a man could have made even his first straight strokes without betraying his latent genius. And with what delight would his admirers study the progress of the mighty hand, through pot-hooks and ladles (as the first curved strokes used to be called in those ancient days when this old man was young), to N's and U's, and finally to complete words—those words of which he was afterwards to become the unrivalled master!

But let us have done with irony, and let us ask in all seriousness, Which is most contemptible—the vain old man, who cannot abstain from exhibiting his most trivial performances to the public eye, or the crowd of flatterers who pander to his senile vanity? The latter are the cause of the mist of self-delusion, in the midst of which their

idol habitually lives. Nor will they ever cease to gather like vultures round a carcass, so long as the Premier of the day holds in his hands all the patronage of the Crown. The peerages, the baronetcies, the knighthoods, and too often the bishoprics, and deaneries, are given not to the men who have best served their country or its Church, but to those who have served the dominant party, or the man in power, and too often to those who have sacrificed their conscience to their interest or their career.

Though Mr. Gladstone has been in this respect the greatest sinner, he is far from being the only one. All party-leaders are more or less guilty. Nor will the evil ever be remedied until it is recognised universally, that the distribution of national honours to reward party or personal services is a gross breach of trust in the minister who permits himself to be influenced by such motives, and an act of bribery and corruption far more demoralising than a few shillings or a glass of beer given to a low-class elector for his vote. We hope and believe that a good time is coming, when the men, who have been made peers, baronets, knights, etc., in return for services rendered to the Prime Minister, will be thought not honoured, but bribed, corrupted, and disgraced by the preferments and dignities, which have been lavished on their unworthiness, and when more enlightened public opinion will condemn and displace every minister who commits these gross perversions of a national trust.

SUSPENDED.

MR. GLADSTONE has, almost in so many words, passed sentence upon the "Newcastle Programme." He has announced that all Government measures are "suspended," and has not denied that that means "practically dropped." So pass away, for the present, alike the hopes of his supporters and the fears of his opponents. It is a striking justification of the criticism which has been passed from the outset upon his pretensions and his methods. But it is a little hard upon those who returned him to power upon the strength of the promises which he now abandons. Still they have only themselves to thank. For example, Mr. William Saunders, who announces that he will have no more to do with the Home Rule Bill, which he describes as "imperfect" and "incomprehensible." We appreciate his disappointment, but we cannot extend to him our sympathy. Why did he elect to support a measure he knew nothing about? It is very much like a man complaining, after signing a blank cheque, that he has been swindled. The Gladstonian members gave a blank cheque to Mr. Gladstone. Now they find it hard to honour it. Who cares? Only the unhappy electors, who find that Ireland still blocks the way more relentlessly than ever.

We may imagine that Mr. Gladstone did not rejoice over his admission. He has been brought most reluctantly to begin to recognise his position, and to understand that even his authority and influence cannot reduce a measure of revolution to the level of every-day legislation. The Prime Minister has, we think, been credited with more moderation than he possesses. Had it been possible for him to compel the House to report the Home Rule Bill on a certain day, we believe he would have done so. He is too autocratic and too self-opinionated to allow any considerations of custom and precedent to control his own personal ambition. But he has had tact enough to see the impossibility of such a course. His followers were not to be trusted. Blindly devoted as Englishmen can be, there is a point at which their common sense steps in and saves them. At that point they are arriving fast. Recent events, foremost among which we place Lord Salisbury's visit to Ireland, have begun to make them see that after all their leader may not be infallible. Time is telling on them, and they want more time. We honestly believe that many of them would gladly put off the moment for finally deciding upon a step which they now perceive involves more important issues than they had imagined. It is very doubtful whether Mr. Gladstone could persuade his own party now to pass the Home Rule Bill within a limited number of days. And as time goes on it will be less and less unlikely that they will refuse it altogether. Meantime the electorate has been taught a useful lesson. When they signed a blank cheque for Mr. Gladstone they were plainly told what to expect. They have been peasants in a fair, buying from the noisiest cheap-jack the most glittering wares, which they now find were made for show and not for use. There was not the slightest chance of the Government bills passing; they were not even expected to pass. They were introduced in order to make a show of keeping impossible promises, and so their object was fulfilled.

And thus the Welsh Suspensory Bill departs from mortal ken. Before we hear any more of Welsh disestablishment the fate of the Government will have been decided. Meantime the Church must stand to arms. The Albert Hall Demonstration was a good beginning, but the work should go on. Why should not great meetings be held in all the big towns of England and Wales? Why should not every Welsh parish be visited by deputations capable of clearly stating the issue and exciting a popular expression of opinion which would be incontrovertible? Why should not the Archbishop of Canterbury himself go on crusade to those distant quarters of his province and refute opponents, confirm waverers, and strengthen adherents. The enemy, having for the present shot his bolt and missed, gives us a grand opportunity for setting him for ever at a disadvantage. Some-

thing like this ought to be done. It is well to begin in London, but not so well to end there also. Now is the time to turn this state of suspended animation into the sleep of death.

Reviews and Notices.

"Lectures on Ecclesiastical History," delivered in Norwich Cathedral. "The Life and Times of Justin Martyr." By the Rev. F. Meyrick. Nisbet and Co.

It is a question worth considering, by those who institute courses of popular lectures on ecclesiastical history, whether the views which are thus presented of ancient persons and their times are really useful to the hearers and readers. Such views are necessarily slight and superficial, nor have most of those who hear and read them the time and opportunity, or the learning and scholarship, which are required in order to test their accuracy. All that they acquire from them is that little knowledge which is proverbially a dangerous thing. Besides this, their composer is generally a man who has opinions to defend and a position to maintain in respect of controversial questions of his own day, so that he assumes almost unconsciously the character of an apologist—if a Romanist, for modern Romanism; if an Anglican, for modern Anglicanism; if a Nonconformist, for modern Nonconformity; and thus, instead of approaching his ancient author with an open and unprejudiced mind, only bent on finding what information really exists in his writings, he is ever seeking, and as he supposes finding, an *ex parte* defence of his own position and opinions.

Such a writer is Mr. Meyrick. He is doubly an apologist—as a Christian, seeking a defence of Christianity, and as a very decided Anglican, seeking a defence of the Anglicanism, which is for him an embodiment of original Christian truth. He is ever inquiring whether Justin held Roman doctrines, whether he believed in transubstantiation, whether he held that Christ was offered in the Lord's Supper as a propitiatory sacrifice for quick and dead, whether he favoured non-communicating attendance, whether in his writings there is to be found "even the shadow of a shade of the medieval doctrines which have been summed up in the Creed of Pope Pius IV., and later decrees, which form the peculiar doctrines of the modern Roman Church."

This method is quite unhistorical. A student of the history of any given period ought, for the time, to throw aside all his knowledge of later developments of opinion, and to place himself in the mental position which the writers of that period held before these later developments came into being. It is only thus that he can see those writers and their period as they really were.

This remark refers chiefly to Mr. Meyrick's sketch of Justin's doctrine. But, on this point, it must also be said in his favour that his account of his author's doctrine is taken scrupulously and carefully from that author's works alone, and that, notwithstanding the apologetic position that he assumes, he has not read into those works the opinions of later authors. He has given a very fair description of Justin's actual views. But he has not been so careful or scrupulous in his account of the Christian worship of Justin's time, to which he still attaches the epithet "primitive," although it was 120 years or more after the death of Christ. In this case he permits himself to go far away from his author, and into far later times. "The particulars of this sketch," he says, "will be drawn in part from Justin's writings, in part from other sources." He does not specify the "other sources" from which he has drawn, but the only authors whom he actually quotes are Chrysostom and Jerome, both of whose writings belong to a period more than 200 years later than Justin's time,* and Tertullian, whose dates are not quite certain, but who may be taken as Justin's junior by about fifty years, and whose local connection was with the Latin Christianity, which was then just rising in Africa, the true birthplace of the Latin Church; whereas Justin was essentially a Greek Christian, nurtured in Hellenised Palestine, educated in Greek philosophy, and martyred at Rome, whose Church continued even to the time of Hippolytus and Callistus, at the beginning of the third century, to be preponderantly Greek. This admission of "other" and later "sources" into the "Life and Times of Justin Martyr" is a very serious blot on Mr. Meyrick's lecture. We recommend him, if his work reaches a second edition, to rewrite that paragraph of it, sticking rigidly to his author, who has left ample and very interesting materials for a description of Christian worship as practised in the middle of the second century after Christ.

These are the only faults that we have to notice in Mr. Meyrick's work. His description of the state of the world with regard to religious and philosophic opinion is as full and good as could be given in so few pages. We do not think, however, that he quite appreciates the cause which placed that noble being, Marcus Aurelius, in adverse contact with Christianity. We have no doubt that, even allowing for the exaggerations and inventions of the martyrologists, many Christians did suffer under the sanction, and even by the death-warrant of the philosophic emperor. He himself alludes to their courage in braving death, and attributes it to mere obstinacy (ψιλὴ παράταξις); but we do not think that he could have had any other motive than a consideration of his duty as a ruler to execute the laws. His noble mind was free both from bitterness and from contempt. But he could not appreciate the conscientious scruple which led the Christians to prefer death to the smallest act of idolatry. He himself was not without his longings after union with Deity; and he hoped, and believed, amidst doubts and fears, that there existed something Divine which loved and cared for him, though he did not know whether that something was one or many, personal or impersonal, but described it equally as ὁ Θεὸς or οἱ θεοὶ, or τὸ θεῖον. It is not likely that, in his high estate, he would ever have an opportunity of observing personally the pure morality of the Christians. And there was a strain of fanaticism, mixed with the purity and quiet heroism of many Christians, which would be very offensive to the sweet reasonableness of his philosophic mind. It must remain doubtful whether Justin's apologies ever met his eyes. Amidst the overwhelming cares of the vast empire, which he faced so nobly in the midst of his prevailing tone of sadness, and to which he sacrificed ease and life, dying at last as true a martyr to duty as our own Henry Lawrence, or any other Christian Englishman, how unlikely it seems that such documents would ever

* Chrysostom, born A.D. 347, died 407; Jerome, born A.D. 346, died 420. Justin's death is placed at about A.D. 163.

reach him, or that, if they did, he would have time to study them seriously. He had been a great student in his youth, but, when he became an emperor, his motto was Ρίψον τὰ βιβλία—Throw away the books, and devote yourself entirely to the serious affairs of life. If Justin and his emperor have met in the higher state, which the latter dimly hoped for, and of which the former felt secure, they will have recognised each other as kindred spirits, though God had led them home to Himself by such very different ways. Perhaps there may be also a little *refrigerium* for Rusticus, the præfect who pronounced the death sentence on our martyr, but who had taught his sovereign (as he thankfully confesses) to abjure rhetoric, and sophistry, and fine language, and ostentatious dress, to forgive injuries, and to be ever striving to correct his own character (ἦθος)—all of them actions, in which lay hidden some unconscious Christianity.

On the whole we are grateful to Mr. Meyrick, and we have much enjoyed his little production. Let him accept our advice to go over it again, in complete oblivion of all that has been thought or written since Justin's days; and in describing the life and times of a man, let him always stick as close as possible to his remaining works and to his period.

CORRESPONDENCE.

To the Editor of the CHURCH OF ENGLAND PULPIT AND ECCLESIASTICAL REVIEW.

THE IRISH CHURCH.

SIR,—In your article on Wales in last week's PULPIT, I observe these words: "The historical fact is that whereas the Irish Church was of foreign origin and of official creation, an innovation supported by a small minority of the population, the Church in Wales," etc.

I wish to ask the writer of the article to give authority for this "historical fact," as he calls it, when, how, and from what source had the Irish Church its origin? In what way was it officially created? What does "official" here mean? And in what particulars did the Reformation of the Irish Church under the Tudors differ from the Reformation of the English Church?

I should like to find out from your writer where he got his information of the "historical fact" above.

EDMUND LAWRENCE.

June 4th, 1893.

THE Dean of Peterborough was recently entertained at dinner by the members of the Loyal St. Matthew's Lodge of the Manchester Unity of Oddfellows, at the Craven Arms, Leicester. Dr. Ingram has for many years been a member of the lodge, in which, as vicar of St. Matthew's, he showed great interest, and advantage was taken of the occasion to present him with an illuminated address in recognition of his services to Oddfellowship generally. The Dean, in acknowledging the gift, said—"Oddfellowship was one of the most startling things he knew of, and he did not think this fact was sufficiently realised. He did not think the Government had yet realised it, but it was well that they should, because in dealing with the important question of old-age pensions they would have to take Oddfellowship very largely into consideration."

DUVAL RESTAURANTS FOR LONDON.—An organisation is being formed with a large capital for the application to London of the Duval system of restaurants. This is an important development of the catering business, because the Duval system, although exceedingly popular in Paris, and therefore known to many Englishmen, has never been applied in London. The *Caterer and Hotel Keepers' Gazette*, in a recent article on the Paris Duvals, says:—"They are wonderfully organised, exceedingly cheap, and all the food sold in them is good and genuine. The food and prices are identical in all these restaurants. As the visitor enters the door-keeper will hand him a bulletin, on which all that he eats and drink will be entered, and which bulletin, converted into a bill duly stamped and paid, will serve him as a passport when he leaves the establishment. The prices of the Duvals are exceeding low; no dish costs more than 10d., and most of them only 5d. or 6d. The Duval secret is to have no waste. The service costs nothing, as the waitresses are paid by tips alone. Tips, though small, add up handsome sums daily. The average Paris tip is 5 per cent. on the total of the bill. Everyone tips. The management gives the girls their meals, including wine, and they choose what food they please." The Paris Duval Company has establishments all over Paris, which are frequented by all classes. The shares of the Company are quoted at a premium of 450 per cent., and the dividend is 21 per cent. per annum. The application of this system to London will be hailed with delight by scores of thousands of persons whose business arrangements compel them to depend upon restaurants or cafés for their food. Without desiring to depreciate the establishments which furnish tea, coffee, and light refreshments, it may be very much doubted whether the large number of young persons of both sexes who rely upon these places for their principal meal are laying up, at a critical time of their lives, the necessary reserve of strength. The usual chop-house or restaurant prices are prohibitive to such persons; and although there are in London many private establishments which endeavour to give the maximum of comfort and solidity for the minimum of cost, these are not sufficiently numerous or well known to effect any good purpose. There seems to be, therefore, a magnificent scope for a company which shall carry out the Duval idea thoroughly in every part of London, so as to place a wholesome and strengthening meal within the reach of the humblest purse. The catering business in London is at best very much blundered over. In a costly establishment it is almost as difficult for a customer to convey to a waiter a clear perception of his requirements, as it is for a new M.P. to "catch the Speaker's eye." The carving is generally atrocious, and, with a few honourable exceptions, the meat is not of the primest national quality. The thrifty housewife who reckons up the cost of an ordinary lunch against the outlay incurred for the separate items is startled by the fearful discrepancy. The catering companies make very large profits as it is, but a little smart adoption of the principle which actuates railway companies, viz., providing for the comfort of the third-class passengers, and a general thriftiness in arrangements, would make that profit really tremendous. The new Duval undertaking in London will not affect the existing high-class restaurants, but will provide for that very large and important section of the community possessing the limited income and also the fine feelings.

PREFERMENTS AND APPOINTMENTS.

Archer-Shepherd, Rev. Thomas Archer Meynell, B.A., Minister of the District of Locks-heath, Hants.
Bicknell, Rev. Herbert Ellington, B.A., Curate of Lewisham and Chaplain to Lewisham Union ; Vicar of St. Chrysostom's, Peckham.
Bright, Rev. John Henry (junior); Curate of Christ Church, High Harrogate.
Brown, Rev. Richard, G., M.A., Curate of Holy Trinity, North Malvern ; Rector of Somerford Parva, Chippenham.
Bryans, Rev. Edward de V., M.A., Vicar of Abbots Bromley, Rugeley ; Vicar of Newton-on-Ouse, York.
Burgon, Rev. Benjamin, Vicar of Purston-with-South Featherston, Pontefract ; Vicar of Stainforth, Doncaster.
Casstles, Rev. Thomas, W., Curate of St. John's, Blackpool ; Organising Secretary to the Irish Church Missionary Society in the North of England.
Chambers, Rev. Joseph James, M.A. ; Minister of the District of St. Barnabas in Parish of St. Mary's, Southampton.
Cole, Rev. J. F., Vicar of Roffey, Horsham ; Chaplain to the High Sheriff for Sussex (Mr. J. Innes, J.P., D.L., Roffey Park).
Gardner, Rev. Herbert, Curate of St. John's, Waterloo, Liverpool ; Curate-in-Charge of Fulshaw Mission District, in the Parish of St. Bartholomew, Wilmslow.
Jennings, Rev. John William ; Rector of Howell, Lincolnshire.
Lang, Rev. William Francis Dashwood, M.A. ; Rector of Deane, Hants.
Lewis, Rev. John H. ; Inspector of Schools in Religious Knowledge for the Diocese of St. Asaph.
Litle, Rev. William Brian Somerville, M.A. ; Vicar of Kensworth, Herts.
Mathias, Rev. John, Curate ; Perpetual Curate of Stainforth, Settle.
Moore, Rev. Thomas ; Rector of All Hallows-the-Great and All Hallows-the-Less, Upper Thames-street, with St. Michael Paternoster Royal and St. Martin Vintry College, London.
Nash, Rev. Charles Hewitson, M.A. ; Vicar of SS. Andrew and Mary's, Maidenhead, Berks.
Newman, Rev. D. H., B.A. ; Rector of South Stoke, Sussex.

CLERICAL OBITUARY.

Addison, Rev. William Fountaine. M.A., Vicar of Ossett and Canon of Gibraltar, at Ossett Vicarage, on the 29th ult., aged 75.
Beasley, Rev. John Theodore Hume, at Kilburn, on the 3rd inst., aged 33.
Benson, Rev. Prockter Melhuish, Vicar of Witheridge, Devon, at Nottingham, on the 18th ult., aged 58.
Emeris, Rev. John, late Rector of Upton St. Leonard's, Gloucester, at 5, Marlborough-buildings, Bath, on the 27th ult., aged 71.
Godden, Rev. William Worcester, M.A., Vicar of Elmstead, at 19, Westcroft-square, Hammersmith, on the 4th inst., aged 67.
Harris, Rev. Henry Thomas, late Rector of Llangynidr, Breconshire, at Gorphwysfa, Guildford, on the 27th ult., aged 76.
Kitson, Rev. William Henry, Priest, Senior Curate of Barnes, at the Rectory, Barnes, Surrey, on the 5th inst., aged 40.
McNeill, Rev. Hugh, M.A., Rector of Derrykeighan, at Gardenvale, county Antrim, on the 27th ult., aged 59.
Meredith, Rev. Robert Fitzgerald, M.A., fifty years Incumbent of the parish, at Halstock Rectory, on the 27th ult., aged 77.
Oswell, Rev. Henry Lloyd, M.A., at 3, Bromfield-gardens, Richmond-hill, on the 4th inst., aged 79.
Potter, Rev. James, at the Parsonage, Ringley, Stoneclough, on the 23rd ult., aged 66.
Preedy, Rev. Digby Henry Cotes, Vicar of King's Norton, at Matlock, on the 29th ult., aged 45.
Pritchard, Rev. Charles, D.D., F.R.S., F.R.A.S., Fellow of New College, Savilian Professor of Astronomy in the University of Oxford, and Honorary Fellow of St. John's College, Cambridge, at Oxford, on the 28th ult., aged 85.
Westropp, Rev. Charles John, at Little Yeldham Rectory, on the 1st inst., aged 72.
Wilkinson, Rev. Isaac Herbert, M.A., of Upper Hare Park, Cambridgeshire, D.L., J.P., Cambridgeshire, and J.P., Bedfordshire, at Poddington, on the 3rd inst., aged 75.

FIRST REMOVE THE CAUSE.

MEN frequently worry and trouble themselves a great deal in trying to cure the symptoms of vital weakness, nervous exhaustion, and kindred ailments, instead of endeavouring to first remove the cause. This can be done by Mr. Harness' Electropathic Treatment without the aid of drugs. It is useless to tell sufferers to employ their minds and bodies in useful work and to forget their disorders, so long as the cause of their troubles is not removed. How can it be expected that when they are fatigued by the least exertion they can occupy themselves by studying, walking, or other exercise? Even in conversation they frequently lose the thread of it and repeatedly find their memory failing them. What can they do? Physic will not cure them—perhaps the leading physicians have failed to afford them any relief, and they have consequently become hopeless. It is to such as these that Mr. Harness' new combined Electropathic Belt and Suspensory is so strongly recommended, as, by its gentle but continuous action, invigorating electric currents are imperceptibly generated and conveyed direct from the spinal cord to the affected parts. It is this scientifically constructed and convenient appliance which silently but surely acts upon the vital organs, and removes the cause of the patient's disease, effecting a wonderful change in his health, character, and conduct, and speedily enabling him to return to his natural tastes and habits, and enjoy once more the full vigour of youth, with all its accompanying pleasures.

We may add that this perfect Electro-medical appliance is exceedingly comfortable to wear, gives wonderful support and vitality to all the internal organs of the body, prevents chills, imparts new life and vigour to the debilitated constitution, stimulates the organic action, promotes the circulation, assists digestion, and promptly renews that vital energy, the loss of which is the first symptom of decay. Its healing properties are multifarious. It stimulates the functions of various organs, increases their secretions, gives tone to muscle and nerves, relaxes morbid contractions, improves nutrition, and effectually renews exhausted nerve force. Acting directly on the system, it sustains and assists its various functions, and thus promotes the health and vigour of the entire frame. Besides these benefits, the mind is maintained in a buoyant, cheerful state, and every faculty is stimulated to the highest condition of intellectual strength.

Gentlemen who read the above announcement have only to visit London and call at the Electropathic and Zander Institute (52, Oxford Street, W.) to be convinced of the marvellous curative powers of Electricity and Mr. Harness' perfect methods of imperceptibly applying the current. The medical officers of the establishment are in daily attendance, and may be consulted free of charge either personally or by letter.

The Church of England Pulpit.

LESSONS FROM THE HIRING FAIR.

By the Rev. JOHN NAPLETON, sometime Rector of Wymington.

Sermon Preached (in Substance) at Kirton Parish Church, on Sunday Evening, May 28th, 1893.

"No man can serve two masters. . . . . Ye cannot serve God and mammon."—St. Matt. vi. 24.

THIS is the day when we bear witness to our faith in that "most ancient of all mysteries" —the Three persons in One God. The theological or ecclesiastical view of it has most probably been put before you this morning in accordance with the teaching of the Church, and it is only right that we should endeavour to have a clear understanding in this respect, especially when, as in the recent London School Board controversy, the ground is being taken from under the feet of our children, and the truth sought to be eliminated altogether from our State and our public institutions, that "he that would be saved must thus think of the Trinity." Those who are not versed in the history and technical meaning of this dogma are bound to think of it as based upon Holy Scripture, and embodying the convictions of faithful men from the uprisings of the Christian Church in ages long gone by. Others, who see beyond the hard-and-fast lines of Creeds and Councils, are bound to pay to it a due deference, and think of it as embodying God's revelation of Himself, however defined or enforced by men.

But there is a practical side to the great doctrine of to-day, which, without any approach to irreverence, we may expand and utilise for our help and comfort, as, for instance, in the lesson of our text. "How can two walk together except they be agreed?" "No man can serve two masters." Let us regard the Trinity in Unity as an illustration of the converse of this. There is perfect unity and agreement and co-operation between all the sacred Persons of the Trinity, each having their separate and distinct sphere of work and of power, as also of honour and homage due from all created beings. Yet in the fullest, most perfect sense, "these Three agree in One." Why, then, should we not learn from this that we—all humanity, that is—have a common Master to serve, a common object in view, even that His glory may be enhanced in our salvation? We have not *two*, but One Master, even Christ, who when on earth was the servant of servants. We are placed in various spheres and stations of life, with differing work and surroundings, but all intended to be parts of one great whole—the Master's household. We are not children of the bondwoman, but of the free; and our reward is promised to be that of sons. And this aim can only be successful if all, masters and servants alike, pull together under one yoke, bearing each others' burdens, and forbearing one another in love.

My friends, you have most of you been much exercised of late through the local custom of the country, which at this season makes so many changes and alterations in the domestic circle. The May hiring fairs are passed, and many have literally stood in the market-place to be hired, whilst others have gone to different houses in search of master or mistress, servant or maid. It will not therefore be out of harmony with your own thoughts if we spend our time this evening in considering the relationship of master and servant in its bearing upon the happiness and well-being of the community, that is, the nation as made up of families, in their turn composed of individuals.

What, then, was domestic service, what was the labourer's social position in the time of our Lord? It was that of the slave, pure and simple. The heathen Gentiles were subject to the Roman Government, and so would be all converts to the new faith. These slaves could hold no property, they had no rights, no appeal from the treatment they were forced to undergo. They carried their life in their hands, for their owners had the power to murder them if they chose. In those days nearly all work of every kind was done by these slaves, labour in any form being regarded as servile and degrading. War or pleasure were considered to be the only honourable employments, which accounts for the awful vice and cruelty that marked the times. Idleness begat wickedness, and St. Paul was obliged again and again to reprove and rebuke his converts for not casting off those old works of darkness "in the which ye walked while ye yet lived in them." But if the lot of the slaves was hard, St. Paul was the last to incite them to rebellion or desertion. He was a lawyer, and he upheld the dignity of the law. He did not come preaching that slavery was wrong, and no Christian could be a slave. The religion he had to preach does not *drive*, it leads. "We *persuade* men. He appealed to them by commending the opposite virtue to the vice or the abuse he deprecated. By inculcating the common brotherhood of humanity, the then popular notion that mankind was divided up into two classes or races, two *bloods* in fact, the bond and the free, was struck at and discredited. By investing labour with its true dignity, doing *all* to the glory of God, the degrading influence of work was repudiated and shown to be a myth. If it were wrong to treat the servant as a

human chattel with no soul to call its own, it would be just as false to pretend that the bodies of the slave and of the master were so differently constituted that health and strength could be best promoted by increasing toil and deprivation in the former, whereas the latter would require to live in indolence and luxury. Men being all of one family, so to speak, its various branches must not be cut off from the family tree, but unite and co-operate; there must be, as it were, a Trinity of work, but a unity of aim. One common message for all men in all times is delivered to us in the Lesson of this morning, even as John first delivered it to the Seven Churches of Asia. It is *one* message, though it comes from "Him Which was, and is, and is to come; from the seven spirits before the throne, and from Jesus Christ." And it is "Grace be unto you and peace." To the slave and to his master it is one and the same, even as they are both children of one Father, and bound together by one law of love, which constrains them to do as they would be done by; be kind and helpful one to another, the master showing every kindness and consideration, the slave every respect and dutiful submission.

But we said that St. Paul upheld the law. This is perhaps most evident in the case of Philemon and Onesimus. Have you ever read that last chapterless epistle of the great Apostle of the Gentiles? If not, study it carefully. It contains the story of a runaway slave. It is not unlikely that slaves, when brought under Christian teaching, may have chafed at their hard lot, and been disposed to demand unqualified freedom. St. Paul seems to have this in his mind when he says, "Let as many servants as are under the yoke count their own masters worthy of all honour, that the name of God and His doctrine be not blasphemed. And they that have believing masters, let them not despise them, because they are brethren." This man Onesimus robbed his master and fled to Rome, hoping to be lost in the crowd there and escape capture. At that time Paul was living in his own hired house certainly, yet chained day and night to a soldier that guarded him as a State prisoner. In some way it fell out that Onesimus came under his influence, and was converted "to serve the living God." He would fain have kept him as a fellow-labourer; but no! He was a fugitive, the legal property of Philemon, and so he is constrained to go back to his master. And here mark that St. Paul does not ask for the slave's emancipation, but tries to change the service of fear into the service of love. He calls Onesimus, "My son, whom I have begotten in my bonds." "Thou, therefore," he writes to Philemon, "receive him now not as a servant but above a servant, a brother beloved, specially to me, but how much more unto thee!" Both were to regard themselves as fellow-servants of Christ, their one and only Master, and in their temporal relations were to be tender-hearted on the one side, and faithful on the other. Christianity, then, does not seek to do away with the mutual obligations of master and servant, much less to permit the servant to work or not, to do as little or as much as he pleases, but rather binds the two together in a community of interests, and condemns the wicked and slothful, the service of the eye instead of the heart.

But times have changed since the Saviour and his last chosen Apostle walked and taught on earth. It is true that slavery is still to be found in the Congo and other parts of the world, but our nineteenth-century civilisation opens up a totally different view. You have looked on *that* picture, now turn to *this*. It is neither slavery nor the give and take of that Christian service which we have pourtrayed as being the ideal of St. Paul. If we say society in this respect has apprenticed itself to the god of greed, we shall not be far wrong. Mammon in *some* form it is, and "ye cannot serve God and mammon." Much of the turmoil caused by angry and vicious passions is excused nowadays on the score of the struggle for existence. But what underlies this struggle? What is the real secret of it? Not merely that the ground is too thickly covered, though of course this may have much to do with, as it were, keeping the wound open. It is rather, and far more extensively, the horrid selfishness as embodied in the craving after gain, which is, as it were, a dead unity without the life giving trinity of love, faith, and humility. "Get all you can and keep it" pervades the labour market, be it in domestic, agricultural, or artizan service. Employers and employed are alike. In such country places as this, and here and there in large towns, you will find now and again the employer who thinks of the real and best interests of those they engage to work for them. Here and there, too, you may come across a Joseph or an Eliezer; but it is the exception and not the rule. The contract is a purely business one. So much work, so much wages. What is the result? Mutual suspicion and distrust. Each can give notice to the other at the dictate of any whim or caprice. I have known a good and conscientious servant dismissed because he respectfully but firmly refused to attend the same place of worship as his master; and I have heard of more than one servant who left his master at a most inconvenient time, and after spending all his wages at the drink-bar, coolly returned and requested to be taken on again! No man can serve Christ and self! Were the great Apostle permitted to write an epistle to "the churches that are in the British Empire," I doubt not he would say some such words as these: "Masters, I declare unto you that to feed, house, and pay your servants is but to discharge the least of your responsibilities; for the labourer is worthy of his hire. Ye should bind them to you by loving sympathy for their own special trials and difficulties, by kindliness and for-

bearance, by rebuking them not hastily nor roughly, but in the spirit of meekness. Make them feel at home, and remember that a few faithful and tried domestics, who feel themselves to be a part of the family, are better than a rapid succession of strange, cold faces." And to the servants he might well utter an exhortation not to change their places from the mere desire for more wages, for an easier place, or for that curse of the modern domestic, more "evenings out," or liberty with little if any limit. "This nomad existence leaves no time for the affections to entwine and fasten. It is far better to grow into the *heart* of one family than to gaze upon the faces of many." And here I trust I may be forgiven if I point out that the local custom of changing every year tends to create these worse than voids, these purely servile engagements, and to render scarcer and more remote that much-to-be-prized institution, now, alas! so rapidly dying out, *the old family servant*.

One word as to the *history* of this mercenary service. To go only as far back as this century. It took the form of *cant*, more especially in the early decades. You all know what *cant* means, and religious cant is of all its forms the most detestable. I will give instances affecting both masters and servants. The first is one founded upon what actually took place in a family who were professed followers of George Fox, the Quaker; and if it provoke a smile, it is yet only too true to nature. A certain grocer had an apprentice whom he asked at night if he had done his work. "Yes, sir," the lad replied. "Have you watered the soap?" "Yes, sir." "Have you sanded the sugar?" "Yes, sir." "Then come to prayers." What an injury to this youth's sense of honesty was here! What a religious farce was this! To give false measure with the lips, and in the next breath to summon with those same lips to pray before the God to whom a light weight and a deceitful heart must mean one and the same thing, an abomination unto Him. But *cant* is not confined to masters only. It is to be met with amongst the ranks of the servants also. The following story, calculated to arouse our indignation rather than our mirth, is a true one. It occurred many years ago. An old bed-ridden lady was recommended a servant as being very religiously minded and strictly honest. The mistress was helpless, and could never be left alone in the house. She soon noticed that she had to ring two or three times of an evening before her servant came. One night, when she was alone, the bed-clothes caught fire, and though she kept on ringing until she was suffocated, no answer came. It transpired at the inquest that this "religiously minded and strictly honest" woman, who used to read the good Book to her mistress with such a long face and a longer drawl, was a thief, having disposed of everything she could purloin, and being actually engaged in selling some goods at a remnant store when her mistress was being burnt to death! Alas! that such a tragedy should be due to the wickedness of such a false servant—false to herself, to her employer, and to her God! "No man can serve two masters."

But the age of *cant* has given place to the age of *covetousness*. "How much work can they do?" and "how much wages can I get?" It is the time of grasping and rasping, of getting everything and giving nothing in return over and above what the law exacts Oh the haggling and the bargaining that there is between intended masters and servants! But the congested state of the labour market must itself tend to cause a good deal of friction, and we cannot be surprised at mistresses being careful to have a right understanding at the outset, if possible, when we experience the detrimental effects of over educating the young, and teaching the girls, for instance, to play the piano when they ought to be learning how to manage their houses and practise *thrift*, instead of scales and the "Maiden's Prayer." Let them rather learn that "to labour is to pray." Can we wonder when we hear of mistresses being poisoned and stabbed as we do, when the maid is trying to serve herself first, and her employer second? "No man can serve two masters."

But the cruel treatment so recently brought to light of a poor girl in London reminds us that what would not be dreamed of in a quiet country place like this has yet a lesson for us all, to treat the young with that gentleness which their tender age demands, and which is essential if we would win their hearts for the service of Christ. We began by talking of slaves. We will close with a word about their modern representative — the "slavey," or town drudge. I was much struck a year or two ago, when listening to one of the musical sketches of our most popular entertainer, Mr. Corney Grain, with the effect produced by his keen and cutting satire upon the employers of this most useful and most abused class of servants. After describing how they have to rise before dawn and slave till past midnight, their only food what no one else will touch, and their bed in some den "where the beetles crawl and creep," a boy exclaimed, loud enough to be heard: "Mother, that's our gal!" evoking the comment, "If the cap fits, put it on." Nor is this slavery confined to the second-rate lodging-house and the petty tradesman's shop. No! In those miserable *shells*, unworthy the name of coffin, which the parish provides for the maid-of-all-work with no friends and no home, there is an unfading record very often contained of disease, suffering, and death, caused by the well-to-do mistress who, grasping in her demands, and rasping with her tongue, has cut off a young life, and is as guilty before God as many who are imprisoned for manslaughter. Oh, how loudly does the claim of our common humanity cry out for something to be done to ameliorate the condition of these poor young flowerless, sunless

lives! Well may the servants in such a place as this, with only a fair meed of work and the fresh air to breathe—well may they thank God who has cast their lot in so much better homes! What grievances they may have are as trifles compared with those of their poor suffering sisters elsewhere. And may our great Master in heaven give us grace to do, each and all of us, our duty in that state of life into which He has been pleased to call us, and to remember that "the disciple is not above his Master, nor the servant above his Lord," so that having served Him alone, He may say to us, "Ye are no longer servants, but sons."

THE RISEN JESUS.

By the Rev. M. B. HOGG, B.A.

Sermon Preached in Keady Parish Church, on Easter Day.

"He is not here; He is risen."—St. Mark xvi. 6.

IT is only in despondent moods and in wayward moments that any man can bring himself to think there is nothing beyond the tomb. For my own part, I do not believe that a positive atheist, in the literal acceptation of the term, ever existed. Doubtless the apparent futility of the lives led by some men here, together with the unwarrantable canonization of all the departed by their survivors, even of the veriest sinners, contributes not a little to the cynicism with which some men of wisdom and experience regard the expressions of hope and symbols of faith we inscribe on the tombs of our dead. Not, therefore, without a show of reason did that interesting, if fitful genius, Mr. George Whyte Melville, write of the custom of belauding indiscriminately our departed. When speaking of life, thus depicted, he says:—

> "The sum of a life expended, a pearl in a swine trough cast,
> A comedy played and ended, and what has it come to at last?
> The dead face pressed on a pillow, the journey taken alone,
> And the tomb, with an urn and a willow, and a lie carved deep in the stone."

But not every life, when rudely cut off by remorseless death, comes within the radius of this sinister and weary declaration. That life, the threads of whose complex web we take up again to-day, after laying them sadly down in the sepulchre hewn out by the pious Arimathæan, was one whose glory could never wane, whose spell could never fade. It was a life, not of mere talk—though its sayings and teachings have inspired the loftiest sentiments of mankind, and dictated the evolution of all that is best and purest in our race, from the consciousness of awakened hearts—but of wondrous practice. For, if it could be asserted without fear of contradiction, "that never man spake like this man," it is equally significant that both friend and foe, critic and disciple, cheerfully chronicle the indisputable fact that "He went about doing good."

And though Christianity, and the system taught by its Founder, make no exception in the universality of the Resurrection, it is, humanly speaking, easy to understand how some minds, cognizant of the workings of human nature, and saddened by its depravity, wearied, too, at the uselessness, sick at heart of the utter selfishness of the lives led by the votaries of folly, of greed, and of passion, have arrived at the distorted, unpalatable conclusion that there is nothing beyond the grave, and that, to use the gruesome, defiant words of George Macdonald's impassioned cynic—

> "The time draws near when we all go out."

"Because I live, ye shall live also," is the Church's note of hope and faith to-day. Had we not the assurance that Jesus died and rose again, we might have doubted not unreasonably whether all were not indeed sadly over when the earth was consigned to mother earth, and the spirit had, perhaps, absolutely and finally surrendered itself to God who gave it. For, in the absence of direct revelation from Christ, what very convincing proof have we of a resurrection from the dead? Prophetic utterances are, at best, vague and disappointing; and although occasionally the prophets voice the yearnings of the Jewish believers after a continuous existence in the world beyond, they are strangely silent on the point. Their words are, at best, the expression of pathetic, uncertain hope; there is nothing "sure and certain." They could but say, in words which seem to have been framed for them, though written in later days—

> "Behold, we know not anything.
> We can but trust that good shall fall
> To each, far off, at last to all,
> And every winter change to spring,"

You do not find anywhere in the New Testament a doubt expressed of the Resurrection as a general, inevitable fact. It is made the very foundation of the system of Christianity. Christ Himself makes it the basis on which the life and potency of His Church rest: "Destroy this Temple, and I will raise it again in three days." "The Son of Man shall be crucified, and the third day shall rise again." "After I am risen I will go before you into Galilee." And although it is admitted that the Pharisees, as distinguished from their sceptical contemporaries the Sadducees, conceded the possibility of both a resurrection and a world of spirit, nevertheless it may well be doubted whether these articles of Christian faith formed any essential part of the Hebrew's creed. Not by Moses, but by Jesus, are we taught to say, "I believe in the resurrection of the body and the life everlasting."

For not Moses, but Jesus, could say with the calm authority of the very and Eternal God, "I am the Resurrection and the Life. He that believeth on Me, though he were dead, yet shall he live."

So strongly did the Apostles, who were commissioned to preach the Gospel to every creature under heaven, urge the necessity of belief in Christ's own Resurrection, that it was recognised by even their adversaries as the very genius of their mission. You remember the words of Festus to King Agrippa (Acts xxv. 19), when that wary and astute diplomatist sums up the charges brought by the Jews against St. Paul as "questions of their own superstition and of one Jesus, which was dead, whom Paul affirmed to be alive." And St. Paul's own written sentiments on the topic, which may be said to have burned itself into his very being, are too well known to need much repetition to-day. One thrilling passage shall suffice: "If Christ be not risen from the dead, then is our preaching vain and your faith also vain; yea, and we are found false witnesses of God, for if the dead rise not, then is not Christ raised." Hence the Resurrection as a general fact, as a universal necessity, did not originate with Jesus, as some erroneously suppose, but was, although not fully believed in, a glorious reality, had the existing Church of God, then in chrysalis shape, now blossomed into rarest beauty in the fulness of Christ, but discerned the revelation imparted to her sons.

And thus the Church of the Lord Jesus celebrates to-day her brightest and most glorious fact. The sombre drapery of the past six weeks is doffed for a season; the wedding garment of gold and purple and fine white linen is joyously assumed. The minor key of faith and penitence, the wail of sorrow and lamentation, is changed into the loud jubilant note of exultation: "Hallelujah! for the Lord God Omnipotent reigneth." The low, sad dirge of self-accusation and willing abasement is turned into the stirring song of victory: "Christ is risen from the dead, and become the first fruits of them that slept." This hopeful antiphon resounds through ransomed Christendom to-day: "Since by man came death, by man came also the resurrection of the dead." "For as in Adam all die, even so in Christ shall all be made alive."

Is there here to-day a person who does not recognise the reasonableness and the brightness of the Christian's hope? I am convinced there is not. He may not adequately feel its potency for himself, but he admits its possibility. Well, Easter embodies the hope of the Church of Christ all the world over. It is not merely a holiday time, though it may well, in a chastened sense, be regarded as permitting reasonable and judicious enjoyment; for if Christ be risen, then His people cannot of a surety "be of all men most miserable." It diffuses its genial sunshine into the darkened chamber of grief, it lights up the chilly dungeon of despair with the brilliancy of hope and consolation. Even a man with his death-warrant in his pocket was enabled to say, in early Christian times, "Blessed be the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, who hath begotten us again unto a lively hope by the Resurrection of His Son" (St. Peter). And with our larger experience of His grace, and our knowledge of His care unceasing through all the intervening ages, we can find no reasonable place in our hearts to-day for gloom or anguish or despair: "He is risen!" is the cry of angels. "He is risen!" is the echo of the Church. "He died for our offences, and rose again for our justification," is the song of the grateful heart in which the "Peace of God abides which passeth all understanding."

I do not know whether it has struck you, as it has long since struck me, that there is a peculiar flavour about the joys of Eastertide which you look for in vain at other seasons of the year. Whether it be owing to the fact that Easter always comes with the spring-time, or whether it has some inherent virtue of its own, I must confess it is to me a season of unmixed spiritual joy. It is often associated with sorrow; for I remember well how, in very youthful days, one I knew was laid to rest at Eastertide, when the innocent children of his own age, all unconscious of loss, were plucking the "lofty daffodil" and wreathing the yellow primrose into a chaplet of flowers for his little coffin; and somehow there is not so much that is dismal or dreary in the thought of death at Eastertide, when the world is ablaze with resurrection life, and the fields are dotted with gay flowers, and the hedgerows are laden with green buds that give promise of much sweetness in the approaching May. You, too, have had your spring sorrows, I doubt not; you, too, know what the awful feeling of death, in the midst of nature's outward life, is: and you have not forgotten, and never will forget, the sight of the dear dead face, so wan and still; and then the outward world sparkling in the Easter sun, the shout of the unconscious children at play, the song of the birds on the overhanging boughs around your lonely dwelling, and the plash of the murmuring river, rushing onward to the sea with a force and a music heightened by the impetus of spring. That outward life amid the inner surroundings of death was God's message of hope to you, my friends: "Thy dead men shall live, together with my dead body shall they arise. Awake and sing, ye that dwell in the ground, for thy dew is as the dew of herbs, and the earth shall cast out her dead." And after a time, I am sure, you arrived at consolation and peace, for you felt that, though the present were dark and stern and bitter, the future might well be as bright and joyous as the spring flowers and the glowing hedgerows. And just such an awakening will the resurrection be; a dreary night, a cloudless morn; a desolate journey, a glorious ending; a surging, swelling river, a golden shore, and a tearless, sinless, illimitable future.

To-day it is incongruous to think of perpetual

death. What seems death is but as autumn decay. Inevitably spring shall come, inevitably life shall again burst forth, and we shall be changed. Nor in this sense need we have much quarrel with death. It is but sleep's twin brother. You remember how the great word-painter puts it:—

> "For this alone on Death I wreak
> The wrath that garners in my heart—
> It put our lives so far apart,
> We cannot hear each other speak."

I am firmly persuaded that the very genius of Easter is joy and gladness. Remember that Christ's appearance to His disciples after His Resurrection was designed to allay their fears and remove their doubts, "while they believed not for joy and wondered." "Fear not, I am He that liveth and was dead, and behold I am alive for evermore." Such truths as these should banish all sadness to-day. There is no place for despair in such an hour as Easter. The very strangeness of the fact we commemorate lends a charm to the wondrous fact itself—One who was dead, alive and living to-day. Have we not often pictured to ourselves the uniqueness of that first Easter Day? What feelings must have been His Who, a Man perfect indeed, with all a man's dread of death and shrinking from the grave, stood alive on the earth, having passed through it all? You and I, in our best and strongest and happiest days, have doubtless felt an occasional pang shoot through our being as we realised that all this could not go on always, that the day must come when the valley of the shadow must be entered, and we almost have caught ourselves, in weak and sad moments, envying those who had laid down life's burden, saying to ourselves, "Would it were safely over!" Christ must on that bright morning, with the sun's rays streaming down in golden showers upon the laughing earth, have felt thankfully, "It is over—the Cross with its horrors, the tomb with its night." And so we rejoice; He passed through it all. It is a reality, and a stern one; but we are confident of a glorious resurrection, an eternal Easter, when we shall "be caught up to meet the Lord in the air."

Brief but decisive are the lessons of Eastertide. Notably the new life is enjoined on us: "If ye then be risen with Christ, seek those things that are above." "You hath He quickened who were dead in trespasses and sins." Endeavour, dearly beloved, as strangers and pilgrims, to abstain from fleshly lusts which war against the soul. Again the happy fact of reconciliation to God through the rising of Christ from the dead is emphasised: "He hath made us to sit in heavenly places through Christ Jesus." "The handwriting of ordinances against us taken out of the way, nailed to the Cross," and pre-eminently the glorious fact of eternal life, begun here, perfected hereafter. "Because I live, ye shall live also."

O yes, brethren beloved, we shall live also; though dead, we shall rise again. It is "Good bye," but not for ever; it is farewell, but not everlastingly. God, at that final resurrection, shall wipe away all tears from our eyes.

> "So shall we lay us down in peace,
> When called to leave this vale of tears;
> For in our flesh we shall see God,
> E'en though we sleep a thousand years."

THE Dean of St. Paul's wishes it to be known that for the occasion of the consecration of Bishops on the 29th inst., application for tickets must be made to the individual clergymen to be consecrated, and not to the Dean and Chapter. The cathedral authorities on such occasions never interfere or issue tickets for reserved seats.

IT is announced in the *London Diocesan Magazine* that the Bishop of London will hold an ordination of deacons on Sunday, October 8th. Deacons then ordained may become candidates for the priesthood at the ordination of Advent, 1894. The *Record* says, "the Bishop is anxious to meet some of the difficulties at present felt by clergy by ordaining at more frequent intervals."

THE first of the Polytechnic Trips for the World's Fair, at Chicago, arrived in New York on Friday afternoon, May 12th. These trips will be continued every week up to August 5th. The parties travel by the Guion Line from Liverpool every fortnight, and from Southampton every Friday and Saturday by the Inman and Hamburg-American Lines. A few vacancies still remain. Full detailed prospectus can be obtained on application to the Secretary, the Polytechnic, 309, Regent-street, London, W.

SUGGESTIVE OUTLINES FOR PULPIT AND DESK, FOR TEACHERS AND LAY-WORKERS. No. 13.—The Blessed Dead: "And I heard a voice from heaven saying unto me, Write, blessed are the dead which die in the Lord from henceforth; yea, saith the spirit, that they may cease from their labours, and their works do follow them" (Rev. xiv. 13.) Introduction, the vision manifested to the banished John at the Isle of Patmos carries away our thoughts for a time from earthly to heavenly things, as Peter and John on the Mount of Transfiguration, were lifted above the world. 1. Death is not necessarily an evil. "Blessed are the dead." No man is blessed during life. Life is a period of trial, sorrow, and woe, but he may be blessed after death, and death alone is the portal by which he can enter on that happy state. 2. There is a limitation of those who obtain the reward. "Blessed are the dead who die in the Lord." As the tree falls so shall it lie. Every man dies, but not every one dies in the Lord. To die in the Lord we must live in the Lord—be grafted into the Lord Jesus Christ. 3. The reward is adapted to our desires. It consists (1) of repose, "They shall rest from their labours." Life is a time of toil, physically, morally, socially, religiously. It consists (2) of recompense, "Their works do follow them." The cup of cold water given to a disciple shall be rewarded. 4. The declaration is sure. (1) It is written on earth, I heard a voice, saying, "Write." (2) It is confirmed in heaven, "Yea," saith the spirit. What encouragement this is to the Christian; faithful endurance will gain an imperishable crown.—THOMAS HEATH, Plymouth.

NOTICES.

All communications respecting the Literary portion of the paper should be addressed to the Editor.

Business communications of every kind should be addressed to Dr. S. GIBBON, at the CHURCH OF ENGLAND PULPIT Office, 160, Fleet Street, London, E.C., to whom cheques and Post-office orders for subscriptions (in advance), three months, 2s., six months, 3s. 6d., twelve months, 6s. 6d., are to be made payable.

The Cases for binding Vol. XXXIV. are now ready.

FOR HEALTH AND IMMORTALITY.

The Ecclesiastical Review.

SATURDAY, JUNE 17, 1893.

PECKSNIFF.

ACTING comes natural to foreigners, but not to Englishmen. Consequently when the Englishman plays a part, he is more successful than his neighbours and pays the penalty accordingly. That is why foreign nations have charitably written us all down hypocrites, not because we are less sincere than themselves, but because we claim to be more so. We have also a different way of concealing our insincerity; the foreign hypocrite somehow lets you partially into his secret, but the Briton is dreadfully in earnest. Tartuffe amuses, Pecksniff revolts.

It is premature to ascribe the part of Pecksniff to the Postmaster-General; still, we confess with regret, it begins to look as if we should have to. Nothing was more conspicuous after the last election than the way in which the Radicals, smarting under a Pyrrhic victory, accused their opponents of every electioneering crime. An organised attempt in the Radical press to discredit the Unionist methods was backed up by the most offensive charges, scattered broadcast. Very few of these charges were developed into petitions, absolutely none were substantiated. After one of the bitterest electoral struggles of our generation, when every nerve was strained by either side for victory, it is remarkable that not one single member of the Opposition, nearly 340 strong, was found to have personally conducted his contest in a way involving any dishonour.

The offensive and disgraceful allegations of the Gladstonians, however, do not in themselves constitute hypocrisy. They might have been regarded simply as discreditable accompaniments of party strife. But to them was added a counterclaim of an absolute monopoly of honesty, and an alleged zeal for purity of methods which would be magnificent, if it were only true. Is it? The *Pall Mall Gazette* gives good reason for doubt on that point. It has published, in authoritative language, an account of the manner in which Mr. Arnold Morley won his seat at Nottingham, which, if true, must be considered as the most dishonourable chapter in modern English political history. This account goes into minute particulars; it is based upon sworn depositions, it gives chapter and verse for everything. It describes bribery and corruption in the lowest forms, not in single instances, but by battalions, done with the knowledge and consent of the candidate, the chief whip of the Radical party, now a Cabinet Minister, and the holder of an important office under the Crown. We can only say that, if this be true, here is Pecksniff with a vengeance, Pecksniff to the very life; for Mr. Arnold Morley, Postmaster-General and Radical leader, the member in question, has borne an important part in the charges made against his political opponents, and is, indeed, officially responsible for them. And what aggravates his offence, if offence there be, is that he was forewarned of the character of the man into whose hands he placed his affairs, who turns out to have previously made a most degrading confession of his unrighteousness, whom nevertheless Mr. Morley publicly approved and deliberately received into close fellowship.

Of course it is very easy to make charges; no one knows that better than Mr. Arnold Morley. At the same time there is a great difference between vague and random accusations, made in hot blood and on the spur of the moment, and a deliberate indictment, made in serious mood, and by responsible persons. Whatever be the rights of the question, a *primâ-facie* case has been made out, and an answer is demanded. No answer has been forthcoming. These charges have been referred to in the House of Commons, and have formed the subject-matter of questions put to the Home Secretary, and unsatisfactorily replied to before Mr. Morley's face. The person most concerned has not said a word; his friend, host, and confidential agent has been dumb. They evidently intend to remain so. How curiously like this is to the conduct of the admirable Pecksniff, whose moral superiority never deserted him, even when he took a kicking.

The matter cannot be dropped. Mr. Arnold Morley must be made to speak. It is intolerable that a man should remain in high office under suspicion of offences which, if proved against him, would drive even the obscurest politician for ever from public life. Meanwhile has not the foreigner right on his side when he rails at "perfidious Albion"? We English talk of corruption abroad, it is time we set our own house in order. Probably in private life Pecksniff will be always with us, at least we might exclude him from public life and from office.

RIDING FOR A FALL.

LATER political developments have introduced uncertainty about the future course of action of the Government. Mr. Gladstone has shown a less stern front to the Opposition ; the Irish have, in return, shown fight to him, and their threats have to some extent lost their terror because of the conflict which has at last broken out in their own ranks.

The unnatural union which has so long prevailed among the Irish is on the point of dissolution, not without premonitory symptoms. Mr. O'Brien has long effaced himself, Mr. Davitt has left the House of Commons, deliberately and with premeditation, now Mr. Sexton has resigned, and has not been able to hold his tongue about it. He has come to blows with Mr. Healy and the Clerical party. The quarrel may be patched up, but the disunion is evident, and it is now plainer than ever that to represent the Irish members as responsible agents, agreed upon a policy, and that one capable of finality, is sheer rubbish.

The want of unity among the other sections of the Gladstonians, though less apparent, is quite as real. There is evidently a large party who like Home Rule less as they see it more, and upon whom Mr. Gladstone cannot count if he tries to hurry on his Bill. To these will probably be added many of the labour members. The debate on the amendment concerning the factory laws was very instructive. The manner in which power was claimed for the Irish to exempt themselves from these laws shows that they propose to act upon it. British operatives will not contemplate with satisfaction the prospect of Irish competition, bounty fed and unhampered by legal restrictions. At least the possibility of this has now been secured in the Bill. The difficulties of the Imperial representation and of the financial clauses cannot be met by postponement, which would be simply playing into the hands of the House of Lords.

Further, behind the Bill is a hopeless programme. Welsh disestablishment has proved a blank cartridge, Local Veto threatens to burst the barrel. And so, if the Home Rule Bill were out of the way, there would only be more trouble, and perhaps worse. In fact, Mr. Gladstone finds himself at last beset with the difficulties which hitherto he has refused to contemplate. We are inclined to suspect that very shortly some sensational political events will take place, which will open a way out of the present deadlock. Mr. Gladstone seems to be riding for a fall. We hope it will be an easy one, but the hope is tempered with the determination that when he falls he shall fall like Lucifer, never to rise again.

THE Convocation of the province of Canterbury will meet for despatch of business on Tuesday, July 4th.

NONSENSE.

WHAT is nonsense, and who can define it? It is like the froth of champagne—empty, frivolous ; yet it gives zest to the dinner, brings smiles into sad faces, and joy to aching hearts ; it does not heal the wound, but it soothes it for the time being. It is the cement of society ; we cannot take our cares to the afternoon tea, the garden party, or the dance, to entertain our friends with, so we leave them behind in reserve, and go into society determined to add one more drop to the cup of nonsense. We see our neighbour beside us laugh, we know there is no hearty ring in it ; we hear his harmless joke, knowing that it is only nonsense ; yet we do not expose his little hypocrisy, for we understand it. Lovers roam about arm-in-arm ; how happy they seem, the future ignored, the past forgotten, the present only remembered. We hear the soft whispered nothings, and see the smiles wreathe the lips in response ; they are tasting the essence of the honey of life, basking in the sunbeams like the butterfly, imbibing only sweetness from the flowers. What matter if the softly whispered nothings are but lover's nonsense after all? Is it not better than scandal, whose poisoned breath turns honey into gall and kills the fairest flower? Better the sparkling froth than the bitter dregs. There comes a time when the froth in our cup has gone, and the reality of life forces itself upon us ; there is a time for tears as for smiles, for earnest work as for nonsense. — DAISY ST. AUBYN.

Reviews and Notices.

"THE EXPOSITOR." June, 1893. London : Hodder and Stoughton.

PROFESSOR MILLIGAN concludes the article on Hebrews vi. 4 6, which he began last month. Coming from the source it does, we must confess to being rather disappointed. Surely those to whom the passage refers are something more than that "large body of professing Christians who have accepted not a few of the fundamental truths of the Gospel, and have experienced no small measure of its power ; but they have come to a pause." Surely it cannot be said of such that it is impossible to renew themselves to repentance. If that is the meaning, we must run the risk of a charge of rationalism, and say the writer of the Epistle was wrong. St. Mark, for instance, came to a pause, and much worse than a pause, when he deserted St. Paul and St. Barnabas on their first missionary journey. But most certainly he did not find repentance impossible. On the other hand, we agree with Professor Milligan that apostates are not mean ; apostates would not be very likely either to know of the words or to care for them if they did. We should say the writer had not any one definite class of persons only in mind ; the warning is general for all to whom it may apply—a very solemn warning, best, perhaps, left for meditation.

Professor Sanday reviews Professor Ramsey's "Church in the Roman Empire." Those who have not yet read the book should do so, and make a note of Professor Sanday's article.

Mr. Allen continues his charge against Professor Marshall, going into regions where we cannot follow. But we notice sadly the statement that Dr. Dalman,

spoken of as "a learned Talmudic scholar," has expressed grave doubts respecting the manner in which Professor Marshall handles his Aramaic.

WE have received from Messrs. James Nisbet and Co. the June number of *The Thinker*, and from Messrs. T. and T Clark the June number of *The Expository Times*. In the former we would draw attention to a paper by Sir H. H. Howorth, on the "First Book of Esdras." Both magazines contain many useful papers.

CORRESPONDENCE.

To the Editor of the CHURCH OF ENGLAND PULPIT AND ECCLESIASTICAL REVIEW.

THE HIGHER RELIGIOUS EDUCATION OF WOMEN.

SIR,—Now that the Oxford Honour School of Theology has been thrown open to women, may I ask leave to draw attention to the very great need in the present day of a higher and more scholarly training in divinity for women, especially those who aim at teaching others.

Take the case of a woman of ability who becomes the head mistress, or even assistant-mistress, of a large girls' school, and is called upon to give divinity lessons. What is her stock-in-trade? In other departments she has been trained and tested; in this she has hitherto been too often left very nearly or entirely to her own devices. At best she can only hope to be a "gifted amateur." All honour to the noblest and earnest women who, if they are devoid of the advantages of technical training, often more than make up for it by their higher gifts and graces, and by the painstaking earnestness which they bring to to bear in what is in many cases little less than a cure of souls." But they would be the first to embrace opportunities, if they came in their way, of *making sure* of what they know already, of filling up gaps and deficiencies, and of acquiring that sense of proportion which all amateur work is apt to lack—as well as obtaining some external guarantee that they are qualified to do what they undertake.

We are very much in want of a body of Christian women, trained in such subjects as evidences, textual knowledge of Holy Scripture (which in many cases might well include some knowledge of one or both of the original languages), and some acquaintance with the great Fathers and Anglican divines.

There must be at least a few who would gladly follow up their ordinary "Pass" or "Honours" work with a year or more spent in special studies of this kind if they had some certificate of fitness in prospect. I am aware that I shall be met with the argument that such studies "do not pay." But is this quite certain? There are many schools in which the known ability to teach divinity would be greatly in the favour of any applicant. And, apart from school work, there is many a country town and sea-side resort where a really able and earnest woman, whose faculties are now lying comparatively idle, would find most congenial employment in gathering classes of young people around her, either on Sundays or week-days, and giving them not only "religious" but theological training. But to do this she must have some proof of fitness, some University or other certificate, endorsed by the bishop of the diocese, otherwise it would seem almost like an act of presumption on her part.

I am aware that a good deal is being done in various dioceses in the way of "higher religious education," and very valuable work it is; but I am contending rather for training on University lines for those who are accustomed to a University standard of work. We want to catch the very ablest women of the rising generation, and to "level up" their theological education to the standard reached and recognised in other subjects. Unless something is done in this way soon, while the religious teaching in our Universities is mainly in the hands of Churchmen, it is highly probable that the Church will be (as too often happens) left behind by Nonconformists.

Thoughtful women have an innate interest in theology. Many a woman has taken refuge in writing an "Agnostic" novel because her mind is full of crude ideas and questioning on religious subjects, and she has never been taught the elements of sound Biblical criticism, Church history, or dogmatics, while, on the other hand, those who do believe would often hardly be able to say what they believe or why they believe it We are losing our old-fashioned knowledge of the Bible; we have often miserably dwarfed conceptions of what is meant by the Catholic Church; we have never been taught to see how the very intellect and knowledge which our secular studies tend to develop has any part or lot in our religious life. We forget that we are to serve God with all our "mind," as well as with all our "heart and soul and strength," and that though a purely intellectual religion has its unquestionable dangers, yet an emotional religion, in which the intellect has little or no part, is fraught with dangers also, not only to the daughters of this generation, but to the sons of the next, whom many among them will influence as only mothers can.

E. WORDSWORTH,
Principal of Lady Margaret Hall, Oxford.

THE IRISH AND THE "WELSH" CHURCH

SIR,—Mr. Lawrence asks my authority for writing, "It is an historical fact that," etc.

My best answer would be to refer him to the history of the disestablishment of the Irish Church, which was agreed to by the English Parliament on the grounds I mentioned. But, as I do not believe in the infallibility of Parliaments, I will briefly state my case, thus:—

The Irish Church, established in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, and disestablished in the nineteenth, was never the Church of the people, and that is the only justification for an established church. In the case of the Irish the Church of the people was the Church of Rome.

In England (I include Wales), the Church of the people, also at first the Church of Rome, reformed itself from within, by the will of the people, expressed through their representatives and acted upon by the proper authorities. The Church of England ceased to be connected with the Church of Rome, not through any foreign interference, but because the nation would have it so.

Nothing of the kind took place in Ireland. There was no spontaneous reformation, not even any desire to change. British settlers, chiefly Scotch, took over their own forms of religion, never adopted by the native

population, and as British authority extended, by conquest, in the island, the Protestant form of religion extended too. That is why I called it official, because there was nothing popular about it. All the men in office, by right of conquest, were Protestants, and they employed their authority to establish their own faith. The Irish had no say in the matter. Their churches were taken from them, their tithes, their glebes, their rectories, appropriated to the use of Protestants. The difference between the English Church and the Irish is precisely this, that the first was of internal, the second of external—*i.e.*, foreign—origin, which, I think, justifies all I have said.

THE WRITER OF THE ARTICLE.

THE SYRIAN PATRIARCHATE EDUCATION SOCIETY.

SIR,—I venture to appeal, through the medium of your columns, to the generosity of English Churchmen upon a question which has an imperative claim to, at least, a patient hearing.

Nearly twenty years ago the aged Patriarch of the Old Syrian Church, known by the title of Mar Ignatius Peter III., Patriarch of Antioch and of all the East, and his Bishop, Mar Gregorius, visited England with the view of enlisting our sympathies in aid of his struggling Church. He came at the invitation of the late Archbishop of Canterbury, and was most graciously received by Her Majesty the Queen, who declared that his stately and reverend bearing enabled her to picture the figure of the patriarch Abraham. Finally, he was dismissed with promises of help, which have as yet been only partially fulfilled.

As English Churchmen we cannot but regard this visit as highly significant. The religious community which he represents extends over the large part of Mesopotamia, from Urfah, by the Euphrates, to Terzeereh, on the Tigris, and from Mosul to Kharpont, and occupies, too, some thirty towns and villages in the neighbourhood of Damascus. In Jerusalem, moreover, they are represented by a bishop and clergy dwelling in an historic building, their property since the days when Jerusalem acknowledged Antioch as its metropolitan city. In our own Empire of India there are over 300,000 Christians owing allegiance to the Old Syrian Patriarch at Antioch.

Their history itself has an interest and an importance which it is difficult to overrate. Severed alike from the Churches of East and West at the Council of Chalcedon, upon a not-proven charge of participation in the doctrinal heresies of Eutyches, they have struggled on amidst all the vicissitudes of history, holding fast to the faith and practice of the Primitive Christian Church. But this has been no easy matter. External dangers from one side or another have continuously beset them. Their great bond of union consists in the maintenance of their national Church in its purest form, and just at present they are sorely pressed to surrender the heritage of their fathers. The Church of Rome is eager to help them, and would succeed, we can hardly doubt, in retaining them as a corporate Church, and in preserving them from attacks either of Turkish fanaticism or of Russian aggression. But we know, too, that there is only one condition upon which the help of Rome can be secured, and that is the absorption of the national into the so-called "Universal" Church, or, in other words, the acceptance of that Papal theory of supremacy in affairs civil and ecclesiastical, which the Eastern Churches have never accepted, and which so large a part of Western Christendom has opposed during the past four and a half centuries.

In her distress the Church of Syria has appealed to the Church of England, as to a sister, for help, and not as to a mistress who will insist upon submission. Her request is modest, and commends itself to the practical mind as being one that asks merely for that help which enables her to help herself. In the concrete form, she wants the personal help of two or three energetic workers, who would lay afresh the foundations of religious education in Syria.

The Patriarch proposes to start an elementary theological school at ecclesiastical head-quarters, which could diffuse instruction through the schools in the villages scattered over the country. Such a school system would require about £500 a year to keep it going, most of which would be spent upon the central theological seminary, as the small sum of £5 10s. a year is all that is necessary for each village school. At present there is urgent need even of the materials of instruction, books being rare and difficult to obtain, and we know that without religious instruction an efficient ministry is impossible. The style of education needed is one that should aim at being essentially Biblical, a deeper and a more spiritual knowledge of the Scriptures being the chief desire of the Syrian priesthood, due to the touching fact that they are suffering from a mental famine which we in England are unable even to realise.

The answer of the Church of England has been in a measure already given in the formation by the late Archbishop Tait of a committee for the purpose of aiding the Patriarch. The committee were enabled in 1892 to send out Mr. O. H. Parry, of Magdalen College, Oxford, to inspect the religious education in Mesopotamia, and which, proved more difficult, to hold out hopes to the Patriarch, which should be sufficient to reassure, without elating, a temperament nervously alive to every possible change in the attitude of the English Church.

The result of Mr. Parry's investigations may be briefly summarised. What is wanted is *immediate* assistance, assistance that would be personal and permanent. The committee desire to send out two or three men who would be willing to turn their backs upon England for some years, and who would, we may venture to say, be the instruments of rendering an incalculable service to the Church of Christ. Their work would not be of extraordinary difficulty. They would be received, as Mr. Parry was, with great cordiality by the Patriarch and the Syrian clergy, and they would, we feel confident, experience as he did, a generous welcome from the American mission there established. Once settled in Syria, they would find the expenses of living cheap (as in all Oriental countries), and they would receive all needful assistance from the committee at home.

That our workers should permanently settle in Syria, and that for a considerable time, is the all-important point. From a practical view, nothing can be more wasteful than the frittering of money over the long out and home journeys from England to Mardin, the capital of the Syrian Church. The slightest educational experience teaches us that nothing is more detrimental to progress than a continuous change of instructors.

Finally, it is not too much to urge that to aid the Syrian Church is at once a duty and a privilege. By

her appeal to us she has acknowledged, that the Church in the United Kingdom has adhered more closely than any other religious community in Western Europe to the primitive practice and doctrine of our Lord's Apostles. It is upon that ground that she bases her claim, and if we do not recognise our responsibility, we are surely in the way of forfeiting our birthright.

A SYMPATHISER.

[The exact ecclesiastical position of the Syrian Church may be seen by a glance at the "Creed of the Most Ancient Syrian Church" (a leaflet published by the Patriarch through the committee, when he was in England in 1874), or by a reference in the *Times*, October, 1874, which contains a letter from the late Dr. Badger, an experienced Liturgiologist, declaring that "a careful survey of their Liturgy led him to a conclusion already reached by Field, the personal friend of Hooker, that the charge of the heresy of Monophysitism was an unjust one. Contributions should be sent to the Syrian Patriarchate Education Fund, at Messrs. Coutts, Bankers, 59, Strand, W.C., or to the Hon. Treasurer, Mrs. Finn, The Elms, Brook Green, London, W. Mr. O. H. Parry is at present residing in England, and will be glad to give the fullest information and addresses on the subject, in any place where there is interest sufficient to welcome him. Letters should be addressed to O. H. Parry, Esq., Forelands, Godalming, Surrey.]

MARRIAGE.

SIR,—The subject of marriage, or close association of the sexes, is a very difficult one *approfondir;* that men and women should be hurried into marriage in order to avoid the wiles of the devil, whether harmony exists or not, appears to my theory as erroneous as confining girls within convent walls in order to promote their chastity, and to save them from temptation. The state of society would be a very hollow and lamentable one if men and women of the nineteenth century could not be trusted to roam the world at large without falling into the meshes laid by original sin. When will people become enlightened that the good or the evil is not so much contracted in our surroundings as in our own hearts and consciences, which are machines to lead us into or out of temptation? No matter what walls of granite are erected to barricade us securely, for my part I consider the free platonic intercourse of the sexes rather tends to promote purity than otherwise. Of course there are evil-minded persons who will judge others from their own standpoint, and excite the scandal of Mrs. Grundy if, in following this theory, Miss So-and-So and Mr. So-and-So are too frequently seen together. What a pleasant world it would be if vice were altogether abolished, and Miss So-and-So and Mr. So-and-So could roam whither they listed without incurring Mrs. Grundy's frown or outraging her notions of decorum!

What an age of form and deception we live in! By our outward formality, or want of formality, we are reckoned up, at least by the world; but it is a consolatory blessing to know that there is a future Judge to call us to book some day, from whom no veil of reserve will conceal the true emotions of the human heart; no cloak of piety hide the secrets buried at its core. That a day will come when the inward and spiritual grace shall have predominance and be predominant, and we shall stand as we are within God's Temple, and the structures of society, with all the forms and formalities, of society's devotees, will be shattered by the mighty hand stretched out from heaven to punish the wicked doer and reward the one who, despite all appearances and creeds, pursues the green fresh unrestricted pastures of liberty and purity.

DAISY ST. AUBYN.

THE preacher at the Bishop of Liverpool's ordination on Sunday last was Canon Burbidge, vicar of St. Michael's, Toxteth Park. The gospeller was Mr. C. E. Stocks.

THE *Church Times* understands that the Bishop-elect of Norwich, the Rev. J. Sheepshanks, has notified his intention of resigning his membership of the English Church Union before entering upon his new sphere of work.

IT is stated that Bishop Pelham does not claim the full pension to which he is entitled under the Bishops' Resignation Act—namely, £2,000 per annum—but has given up one-half of that sum to his successor in the see of Norwich.

IT is stated that the Dean of Exeter, who was compelled some six months ago to seek a change on the Continent for the benefit of his health, has within the last few days returned to Exeter, after a prolonged stay in Rome. The Dean has recovered much of his former vigour, and since his return has taken part in the services in the cathedral.

WE understand that the Dean and Chapter of Durham have not the least intention of giving up the idea of commemorating the 800th anniversary of the foundation. The first idea was to celebrate the laying of the foundation-stone in 1093, and at a final consideration of the question some weeks since it was determined that it would be more appropriate to celebrate the consecration in 1095. As to which was the fittest time there was considerable difference of opinion, but it was never contemplated to give up the commemoration altogether; and the probable completion of the restored Chapter-house early in 1895 was an additional reason for celebrating both events together.

PREFERMENTS AND APPOINTMENTS.

Arrowsmith, Rev. Sydney T., Vicar of St. Mark's, Liverpool; Vicar of St. James's, Ogley, Hay, Walsall.

Bailey, Rev. J. H. E., M.A., Vicar of Burscough Bridge, late Chaplain H.M. Forces; Acting Chaplain to the 3rd Volunteer Battalion the King's Liverpool Regiment.

Baldwin, Rev. A. W.; Chaplain to Her Majesty's Prison, Wormwood Scrubbs.

Benson, Rev. John Peter, M.A., Curate; Rector of Witheridge, Devon.

Bryans, Rev. John Lonsdale, M.A., late Rector of New Radnor; to the Consolidated Chapelry of St. John's, Cwmbach, Llechrhyd, Brecon.

Cary, Rev. H. L. M.; East London Clergyman.

How, Rev. H. Walsham, M.A., Vicar of Mirfield; Chaplain to the Bishop of Wakefield.

Keene, Rev. Rees, M.A., Lecturer of St. Bees' Theological College; Secretary and Treasurer of the Oxford Mission to Calcutta for the Diocese of Carlisle.

Lampet, Rev. W. E. L., M.A., Vicar of Great Bardfield; Rural Dean of Sampford.

Lane, Rev. John Reynolds, M.A., Vicar of Elmore; Chaplain to the High Sheriff of Gloucestershire (Sir W. F. Guise, Bart.)

Law, Rev. W. Smalley, M.A.; Vicar of Abthorpe, Towcester.

Lowthian, Rev. W., M.A., Curate of Egton-cum-Newland; Perpetual Curate of Troutbeck, Windermere.

Mosse, Rev. Charles Wynne, M.A.; Licensed Preacher in the Diocese of Durham,
Nash, Rev. Henry Allden, Vicar of St. James's, Ogley, Hay, near Walsall; Vicar of St. Mark's, Liverpool.
Nicholson, Rev. W. W.; Chaplain to the *Thunderer*.
Pearson, Rev. Charles William; Vicar of Walton, Aylesbury.
Perowne, Rev. A. W. T., M.A.; Domestic Chaplain to the Bishop of Worcester.
Powles, Rev. G. Le B., M.A.; London Diocesan Home Missionary.
Raffles, Rev. R. B., M.A.; Chaplain of the North-Western Fever Hospital, Haverstock-hill.
Reaney, Rev. George Sale, Curate of Bickley, Kent; Vicar of Christ Church, Greenwich.
Reece, Rev. John Francis, B.A.; Rector of Llanfwrog; Chaplain to the High Sheriff of Denbighshire (General Wynne).
Roberts, Rev. Henry Charles D., M.A.; Rector of Wheathill, Bridgnorth.
Savage, Rev. Henry Edwin, M.A.; Rural Dean of Jarrow.
Sanderson, Rev. Robert; Licensed Preacher in the Diocese of Carlisle.
Simeon, Rev. Algernon Barrington, M.A.; Rector of Bigbury, Devon.
Smith, Rev. Harry Butler, M.A.; Chaplain to the Sanatorium at Durham School.
Spearing, Rev. William, G., M.A., Curate of Sneinton, Notts; Curate-in-Charge of St. Bartholomew's Mission Church, Nottingham.
Squire, Rev. Charles Edward, M.A., Vicar of Long Grove, Ross; Vicar of Southrop, Lechlade.
Taft, Rev. John Reuben, Rector of Great Massingham, Swaffham; Vicar of St. Andrew's, Southport.
Thomas, Rev. Robert, Head Master of Caistor Grammar-school; Vicar of Cabourne, Caistor.
Thomas, Rev. J., Vicar of Eastleigh; Surrogate for the Diocese of Winchester.
Townley, Rev. C. G., M.A., Perpetual Curate of Troutbeck; Perpetual Curate of Egton-cum-Newland, Lancashire.
Trehearne, Rev. George H.; Chaplain to the *Australia*.
Trott, Rev. Henry W., M.A., Senior Curate of Wilmslow; Vicar of St. Lawrence's, Over Peover, Knutsford.
Ward, Rev. Arthur Hawkins, Warden of St. Raphael's Sailors' Church and College, Bristol; Vicar of St. Raphael's, Bristol.
Ward, Rev. Harry, Vicar of Albrighton, Shrewsbury; Vicar of Appleton-le-Street, Malton.
Webb-Peploe, Rev. Frank H., B.A.; Missions to Seamen Chaplain for the shipping, fishing vessels, and barges on the Tyne, and for the Seamen's Church and Institute at South Shields.
Wilkinson, Rev. H. Browne; Vicar of Kirby Grindalythe, York.
Williams, Rev. A. Garnons; Rector of New Radnor.
Wood, Rev. Edwin George, M.A., Curate of All Saints', Margaret-street; Vicar of St. Stephen's, Shepherd's-bush.
Wrey, Rev. Albany Bourchier Sherard, M.A.; Rector of Tawstock, Barnstaple.
Wright, Rev. C. H. H., D.D., Vicar of St. John's, Liverpool; Grinfield Lecturer on the Septuagint in the University of Oxford.

CLERICAL OBITUARY.

Feachem, Rev. Algernon, M.A., clerk in holy orders, formerly Rector of East Horsley, Surrey, at his residence, Dorking, on the 6th inst.
Gunton, Rev. Frederick, Fellow of Magdalen College, Cambridge, at Chester, on the 3rd inst., aged 48.
Harding, Rev. John Wingfield, formerly Vicar of Cheswardine, Market Drayton, at Churchfield, Market Drayton, on the 6th inst., aged 75.
Jefferies, Rev. Edward, formerly Rector of Grasmere, at Glenthorne, Grasmere, on the 9th inst., aged 78.
North, Ven. William, Archdeacon of Cardigan, and Rector of Llangœdmore, at Treforgan, Cardigan, on the 7th inst., aged 85.
Teale, Rev. William, M.A., Assistant-Priest, St. Cuthbert's, Kensington, on the 8th inst., aged 50.
Tickell, Rev. George, formerly scholar of Balliol and Stowell Fellow of University, on the 5th inst.
Whish, Rev. John Charles, M.A., formerly Vicar of Holy Trinity Church, East Peckham, at 60, Caversham-road, on the 6th inst., aged 78.

FIRST REMOVE THE CAUSE.

MEN frequently worry and trouble themselves a great deal in trying to cure the symptoms of vital weakness, nervous exhaustion, and kindred ailments, instead of endeavouring to first remove the cause. This can be done by Mr. Harness' Electropathic Treatment without the aid of drugs. It is useless to tell sufferers to employ their minds and bodies in useful work and to forget their disorders, so long as the cause of their troubles is not removed. How can it be expected that when they are fatigued by the least exertion they can occupy themselves by studying, walking, or other exercise? Even in conversation they frequently lose the thread of it and repeatedly find their memory failing them. What can they do? Physic will not cure them—perhaps the leading physicians have failed to afford them any relief, and they have consequently become hopeless. It is to such as these that Mr. Harness' new combined Electropathic Belt and Suspensory is so strongly recommended, as, by its gentle but continuous action, invigorating electric currents are imperceptibly generated and conveyed direct from the spinal cord to the affected parts. It is this scientifically constructed and convenient appliance which silently but surely acts upon the vital organs, and removes the cause of the patient's disease, effecting a wonderful change in his health, character, and conduct, and speedily enabling him to return to his natural tastes and habits, and enjoy once more the full vigour of youth, with all its accompanying pleasures.

We may add that this perfect Electro-medical appliance is exceedingly comfortable to wear, gives wonderful support and vitality to all the internal organs of the body, prevents chills, imparts new life and vigour to the debilitated constitution, stimulates the organic action, promotes the circulation, assists digestion, and promptly renews that vital energy, the loss of which is the first symptom of decay. Its healing properties are multifarious. It stimulates the functions of various organs, increases their secretions, gives tone to muscle and nerves, relaxes morbid contractions, improves nutrition, and effectually renews exhausted nerve force. Acting directly on the system, it sustains and assists its various functions, and thus promotes the health and vigour of the entire frame. Besides these benefits, the mind is maintained in a buoyant, cheerful state, and every faculty is stimulated to the highest condition of intellectual strength.

Gentlemen who read the above announcement have only to visit London and call at the Electropathic and Zander Institute (52, Oxford Street, W.) to be convinced of the marvellous curative powers of Electricity and Mr. Harness' perfect methods of imperceptibly applying the current. The medical officers of the establishment are in daily attendance, and may be consulted free of charge either personally or by letter.

The Church of England Pulpit.

SPIRIT-RAYS.

By the Rev. SINCLAIR CAROLIN, M.A.,
Rector of Wyvenhoe, Colchester.

Sermon Preached in Wyvenhoe Parish Church, on Whit Sunday Morning, 1893.

"Know ye not that your body is the temple of the Holy Ghost which is in you."—1 Cor. vi. 19.

THESE words of the Apostle, written to the Corinthian Christians of his day, may be taken as applying with equal force to Christians of every country and of every age. They contain a truth, which in itself is a very Gospel. For what tidings can be more glad than this, that the Holy Ghost, the Lord, the Life-giver, is in us, and for the Redeemer's sake takes up His abode in the bodies of the redeemed?

And yet, as the Gospel may be a savour of death to some as well as a savour of life to others, so with this single Gospel truth. Such an inestimable benefit as the actual indwelling of the Holy Ghost in every one of us cannot but bring with it very grave responsibilities, and ought to produce in us very marked effects. And it is just in proportion as we do or do not realise those responsibilities and exhibit those effects, that it is a savour of eternal life or eternal death to us.

It is important, therefore, for all who name the name of Christ, to try to take in the meaning of this truth, to grasp and realise the greatness of this great gift which is given to us, and to become impressed with the true nature of the results which ought to follow from it.

In endeavouring to help you to do this in some degree, let me ask you to turn your thoughts from the written word of God (in which the fact of this gift is recorded), to that which has been very aptly called God's picture-book, the book of nature. For, to those who have eyes to see and hearts to understand, it contains many beautiful illustrations of this and other deep, important and mysterious truths.

As we wander through the fields in the early hours of some bright morning, we have often noticed the countless dewdrops glistening on the blades of grass, and making the ground around us seem strewn with diamonds. Now what makes these dewdrops glisten and sparkle? If we were to examine one of them carefully, we would see that in every one of them there was a perfect image of the sun: not merely a ray of sunlight, but the whole sun, shining from out of its pure depths, giving out more or less brightness according to the capacities of the drop. In fact, although the sun himself is but one, yet he is (so to speak) in every individual dewdrop. Just as if you yourself were standing in a room, surrounded by several mirrors, you might with perfect accuracy be said to be in each mirror; so the one sun is in each dewdrop, and each dewdrop reflects from its purity the perfect image of the sun which is in it.

Thus we have a beautiful illustration in the first place of how the Holy Ghost can be said with perfect accuracy to be in each one of an indefinite number of other beings. And does not the difficulty of realising this hinder us from realising as we ought the Personality of the Holy Ghost, and thus in some degree detract from the dignity of the truth: "Your body is the temple of the Holy Ghost which is in you"?

But, again, just as the sun may be said and may be seen to be in each dewdrop, so in fact he may be said to be in every object on which he shines. But the effect is not the same in all cases. And it is to the effect produced by the sun in the various objects of nature, more than to the actual fact of his being in them, to which I would ask you now to apply yourselves.

There are substances in nature on which the sun shines, and in which therefore he is, which yet are in no visible way affected by his shining. All his light is absorbed, swallowed up by those things which we call black. Though under his powerful influence, though he is actually in them, they are no different than if he had never shone on them at all.

And there are substances in nature on which the sun shines, and in which he is, which reflect back in dazzling purity like the dewdrops and the snow, and those things which we call white, the whole of that pure light which they receive from him. That they may do this is the object for which he is in them.

And so, too, it is the object of the Holy Ghost in dwelling in us, that we may reflect His image from our own persons; that there may be seen in us a perfect image of Himself, Who is one with the Father and the Son. It is, therefore, just in proportion as this is or is not the case with any one of us, that His dwelling in us will be a success or a failure, a savour of life, or a savour of death.

There has been but One of all the human race, from Whose pure heart and by Whose pure life was reflected the full brightness of the Father's glory and the express image of His person, and that was the Lord Jesus, as He Himself said: "He that hath seen Me, hath seen the Father."

But there are many—it is sad to think how many—whose bodies are the temples of the Holy Ghost which is in them, and yet who reflect absolutely nothing of His glory. Like the black things in nature which absorb the sunlight, and are

not affected by his indwelling, so their black hearts show no indication whatever of His presence, and might as well, to all intents and purposes, never have come under His influence at all, and "If the light that is in them be darkness, how great is that darkness!"

But let us turn again to Nature's book. There we find that the light of the sun, though in appearance white, is really the combination of many differently coloured rays. These rays are shown by a prism of glass, or by the rainbow; and wise men tell us that that which in nature we call colour, in all the varied hues and tints in which we see it, is simply caused by the various substances absorbing some and reflecting others (one or more in varied proportions as the case may be) of these colour rays. And thus all things in nature but the black do reflect in some degree, some more and some less, the image of the sun which is in them.

Just so, Holiness which is the perfect character of God, is made up of various virtues, each of which is shown forth in its due proportion and perfection in Him alone; "There is none good but One, that is God."

These virtues (spirit-rays, if we may so call them) are called by St. Paul the fruits of the Spirit, and are as follows: Love, joy, peace, long-suffering, gentleness, goodness, faith, meekness, temperance. And between the all-pure, all-holy Jesus, who reflected all, and the poor black-hearted members of Christ who reflect none of these spirit-rays, there comes a vast crowd of persons, in whose bodies the Holy Ghost dwells, and by whom some, in a greater or less degree, some one or more of the spirit-rays shine forth: but from none, all; or, if all, yet none perfectly.

One more hint from the chapter on colour in God's picture-book before we close. It is not the most brilliant and striking tints which reflect the greatest number of colour rays. On the contrary, a single ray much intensified is much more striking. A red, or a yellow, or a blue, is to many minds more attractive and striking than a quiet grey, which yet is composed of four rays or more, in order to give it its soothing, pleasing influence.

Just so, a single divine virtue or spirit-ray, much intensified, will often make a greater sensation when reflected in a Christian's life, and be more attractive in the uneducated eyes of the world than the quiet unobtrusive life which reflects many more spirit-rays, and approaches much nearer to reflecting the pure light of the Holy Ghost, and yet the latter is the more pleasing in the eyes of Him with whom we have to do.

And this is what the Christian has to aim at, more than to please the fancies of spiritually uneducated men of the world; to seek the praise of God rather than the applause of men.

But, although it is not possible for us ever in this life to reflect in its full brightness the light of the spirit of life which is in us, yet this is the aim we must ever keep in view, "To be perfect as Christ was perfect." True, we shall often be sadly grieved, disappointed, and cast down. It is not the fault of the Holy One Who is in us that His image is not seen in us. But the frailty and wickedness of our mortal nature will, in spite of all our efforts, cause many a spirit-ray to be absorbed and imprisoned, even though it is struggling to burst forth, and we ourselves long for it to do so.

And when, after earnestly praying, as every true Christian must often pray, "Lord, show me Thyself and show me myself," the almost despairing cry bursts forth from our disappointed lips, "Who shall deliver me from this body of death?" then let us take courage, and thank God that through Jesus there is hope; and let us wait patiently (watching, praying, and struggling in the meantime), unto the coming of the Lord. Then He, Who has begun a good work in us, will bring it to perfection, and present us faultless before the presence of His Father with exceeding joy, our bodies made clean by His body, and our souls washed in His most precious blood.

THE INFLUENCE OF THE HOLY SPIRIT ON CHARACTER.

By the Rev. WILLIAM GUNTER, B.A., Rector of Abberton, Colchester.

Sermon Preached in Wyvenhoe Parish Church, on Whit-Sunday Evening, 1893.

"Have ye received the Holy Ghost since ye believed?"—Acts xix., part of 2.

THIS is a very startling question, standing by itself, and if addressed in all seriousness to any one of us, would be found to be not only startling, but on the spur of the moment almost unanswerable by the greater number of us. And even when you refer to the part of Scripture from which it comes, and view it in the light of the context and the circumstances under which it was asked, it is not to be altogether shorn of its difficulty without patient thought and consideration. And yet, although, perhaps, a little obscure, it is quite worthy of thought, for it opens out a subject of much importance in the present day, and a subject which divides Christian people from one another more than is apt to be thought. To go back, then, to the times in which and the circumstances under which the question appears must be our first task, and then, perhaps, if we shall have been fortunate enough to grasp the principle which prompted it, we can go on to see the force of its application to people in our own times.

Who are the people to whom the question was put? Certain disciples living at Ephesus, whom St. Paul came across in his travels as the first great Christian missionary. These disciples were evidently earnest men, anxious to get at religious truth.

They had heard a great deal of the remarkable events which had been stirring up the people who lived in and about Judæa, and they had gone so far as to enrol themselves in the ranks of some of their own countrymen, who had evidently returned from Judæa with some definite ideas about the new doctrines which had been spreading about. When John the Baptist dropped, as it were, from the clouds, with his marvellous eloquence, with the austere habits and quaint garb of a hermit, earnest without being a fanatic, bold to a degree, and yet most reasonable in his rebukes, amongst a people just ready to welcome any truth, after the narrow-mindedness, the red-tapeism, the anomalies and hypocrisies of the Scribes and Pharisees, which they had known for so long and were now sick to death of—why, it was only natural that his presence should be welcomed, that crowds should gather round him and be delighted at the notion that a new phase of religion was soon to be presented to them—a phase which, at all events, had truth at the bottom of it to recommend it to their earnestness, and an injunction to turn away from evil as a *sine quâ non* to satisfy their common sense; and no doubt there were many of all countries passing through Judæa at the time—for Jerusalem was a great centre for the meeting of Jews of all nations, who used to collect together to that city as to the special dwelling-place of the Most High, as the Mohammedans still do to Mecca—and then dispersed to the various countries to which they happened to belong; and *there* too would be many congregated round John—mere pilgrims in this sense—who would gather and treasure up the pith of the Baptist's teaching, and on their return to their homes relate their adventures and begin to form little societies for the spreading of these new and self-evident truths. Hence would these truths soon find their way far and wide, and in distant countries pave the way for the higher and more spiritual teaching that were to be made known so soon after. And in this way, no doubt, disciples of John were found in this city of Ephesus, disciples not only who had heard of John's fame and doctrine of repentance, which had appealed so strongly to their reason and conscience, but who had publicly professed their belief in the same by being baptised in his name, as a sign and badge of their readiness to be counted amongst his followers.

When, therefore, St. Paul met these disciples amongst others collected in this city to hear him proclaim the truth as it is in Jesus, he, seeing their earnestness, was anxious to become more intimate with and to drive home into their hearts the need of the development of all the higher graces of Christianity in their daily lives, to press upon their eager wills the desire, not only for the negative truths taught by John—the repentance of sin and the abandonment of evil habits—but also for the putting on of the new man, the reclothing of righteousness, the spiritual graces of love, joy, and peace in the Holy Ghost; and knowing that such results were not to be arrived at in the strength of man alone, he wanted to know from their own lips what power they had learned to invoke for the bestowal of these great inner gifts of the Spirit, if so be they had as yet attained to any. It was as if he had said to them: "Can it be that these blessed later truths, first taught in fulness on the first Whit-Sunday, by the shower from on high of spiritual power, spiritual courage, spiritual hope, spiritual faith and readiness of speech, which fell upon the disciples on the great Day of Pentecost, have already reached to these far-away corners of the earth through which I am journeying? Are you men here, in this remote city, anxious, as I see you are, after the truth, really already, not only acquainted with the glorious promises of the Comforter, but have even attained *to* those promises, have personally yourselves grasped the meaning of them and applied them to your own lives. Wonderful indeed, then, is the working of the good God above. Mysterious indeed are His ways, for of whom could they have received this knowledge? at whose feet could they have sat to drink in the blessedness of these things, which God in His mercy has vouchsafed to us His Apostles, and to us as a rule alone, in His usual way of using the weak things of the world to confound the wise and the mighty, that we, through the foolishness of preaching, may spread them for the healing of the nations." And hence, to test them as to the extent of their progress in things Christian, he puts to them this straight question of the text, "Have ye received the Holy Ghost since ye believed?" We should have thought they would have been taken aback by so point-blank a question as this; there are few since those days but who would have been startled by it. But these disciples apparently are not in the least ruffled, and reply quite calmly, "We have not so much as heard whether there be any Holy Ghost." "Unto what, then," is St. Paul's rejoinder, "were ye baptised?" for if ye have been baptised with Christian baptism according to the Saviour's own form of words, "In the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost," the expression cannot be unknown to you, whatever the power of it may be. "And they said unto him, Unto John's baptism;" and the Apostle at once perceived the secret of their anxiety to learn and to listen and to receive him, although they had not yet been endowed with power from on high, with the new gifts so lately poured out upon the Church at Jerusalem. They fell short only in proportion to the knowledge attained to—a knowledge limited to the teaching of the Baptist, of repentance and of a preparing for a Saviour about to appear, who would baptise with the Holy Ghost and with fire, but who, as far as they knew, had not yet appeared, or at least who had not yet fulfilled this promise of sending the Holy Ghost to comfort them

and make them sufficient for all things. But up to what they did know they had all along fully acted. They were loyal to the great cause which at the first had so excited their love for truth and respect for well-doing, and so were they quite prepared to accept the development of this same cause whenever such development should be made known to them. They may have heard of the Holy Ghost in a sense, but not till now did they understand how near He was to them, how ready to help and guide them and lead them on from strength to strength whenever they might appeal to Him. But when they did understand, they rejoiced with love unfeigned, were baptised by the Apostle in the true faith, received His blessing by the laying on of hands; the Holy Ghost came upon them, and they too prophesied and spake with tongues. These in their turn manifested the power of the Holy Spirit of God, as did the disciples before them in Jerusalem.

The use that is generally made of this remarkable passage, brethren, is to apply it to dogmatic theology, to the question of baptismal regeneration, and the rite of confirmation; and plainly enough do they bear upon such prominent and important points of the tenets of our Church. But it is not to any such use that I would turn the passage this evening; rather would I ask you to look at the incident from another standpoint, and see how it invites us to muse on a matter more important still, viz., the broad gulf that exists between the theory of religion and the practice of it; between religion as a grand idea, and religion as an elevating power; religion as appealing to the imagination in all its grandeur of possibilities—as the force of electricity does, when we think of all it might be brought to do for us—and religion used by us with the energy and knowledge already ours, as electricity is made use of diligently, as far as our experimental knowledge of its power allows us, for the practical benefit of civilisation. To this end would I ask you to consider the passage before us, and in doing so you will notice that these disciples at Ephesus were anything but theorists at heart, though they were so by force of circumstances. They acted up to their lights as far as they knew; but when the additional knowledge was brought to them by St. Paul of Christian baptism in the name of Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, and of the outpouring of the Spirit upon willing souls, they gladly and without hesitation embraced the glorious offers therein implied, and in reward were conscious in themselves of a power hitherto unknown to them, and of a strength and light and hope probably never even dreamt of by them. How is it with many of us? Do we, in this very point of "receiving the Holy Ghost," this promise of an indwelling, life-giving Spirit, try to utilise the great gift, as God, in His love for us, would have us do? (Christians are divided from one another far more by theories of the truth than by the practice of it, for in the practice of it we of all shades of opinion resemble one another much, in that we all fall short). The true power and influence of the Church, as a body, is not to be estimated by outward things, but by the inner life of its several and individual members—and, too, not by what they, as individuals, do so much, but by what they are in themselves. If every one of us were more truly concerned to realise our own baptism, to appeal for this holy gift of the Spirit, and work that systematically in our own hearts, and try there to cultivate the Spirit's fruits of love, joy, peace, which can come from no other source in the world but from the Holy Spirit, and banish every other motive, every other notion, every other object, in our religious moments, whether in secret meditations or in public worship—if we were to make this our chief care, we should soon prove for ourselves the power of God, and approve ourselves in the eyes of others—though that is but a secondary matter—as good wine that needs no bush; and we may then safely leave the more knotty points of our faith—highly needful, no doubt, to theologians, and important as bulwarks when the whole structure of the Christian faith is attacked, but only impediments in the way of individual Christian progress—we may safely leave them to the care of those whose painful business it is to have the burden of them laid upon their shoulders. Controversy in matters of theory is undoubtedly a great attraction to the human mind, and unfortunately, at times, is necessary; but controversy also tends to bar the door of the heart against the graces of the Spirit, while at the same time it is only by means of these same graces that the truly Christian character is built up. In many points of difference the same thing is in reality meant, though expressed in different terms. We differ about terms, and agree about the substance underlying those terms, and yet think much of the terms and little of the substance; and so much so that there is no room, no thought, no time—life is too short for it—for the serious and constant inquiry, which is really the longing of every sincere and earnest soul, How am I progressing in my own self? Am I building up in my own heart and life, or am I at a standstill? Am I adding to my faith virtue, and to my virtue temperance, and to my temperance patience, and so on to godliness and brotherly kindness and charity? or am I, as regards these grand qualities, which go to make up the daily happiness of myself and those around me—am I, as regards them, just where I was before? These, brethren, are the evidences of the existence of the Holy Spirit in the heart, and whosoever possesses them, and lives under their influence, is most assuredly led by the Spirit, and thereby is a true son of God and joint heir with Christ of all the good things prepared by God for those who love Him.

And, in the light of such eternal verities as these, how far into the shade must the minor differences

and difficulties of life find themselves put. There must be definite doctrinal boundaries to any faith, even as the Saviour showed plainly when amongst men. Faith must be defined; there is no such a thing as a vague faith. But it is loss of time and energy to be for ever fretting about the boundary line, to the neglect of the very one thing all faith is to lead to, viz., the purification and edification of the life itself, of the soul and of the soul's longings implanted by God. And even when we reach to more dangerous impediments still to spiritual improvement, and come in contact with difficulties which science has brought to light—difficulties which interfere with old-established beliefs, and which, in some souls, have darkened hope and destroyed energy, and almost faith altogether in the unseen—even in such disastrous cases there is comfort to be gained from this glorious life-giving subject of the indwelling of God's Spirit and of His work in the heart. For the most advanced and the most learned of Agnostics have to confess that, when they come to the end of their researches, there is still, as the great Tennyson has put it, "A veil behind which no human skill and power of intellect can go;" and it is just behind this veil where God's Spirit in the heart of man is concealed, the power of which is only brought forth when we seek Him, each one for himself, and try to work with Him in the deepening of the heavenly qualities within.

And this much, then, may we be reminded of, from this all-important side of God's truth, to which our Church directs our thoughts on Whit-Sunday—the absolute necessity for each one of us to devote his chief thoughts and endeavours in religious matters to the cultivation of the Christian graces in his own heart, and not to trouble so much about other motives, other springs of action, or of the difficulties that must attend every definition of truth. The veriest child can attain to spiritual strength and happiness in this way, by being careful in the practice of Christian obedience towards parents and those in authority, and love and kindness towards all; and so call, even in their earliest days, upon God's Holy Spirit, in whose name they have been baptised, to help them and be with them in their struggles upwards. As they grow older, and think, they will recognise the true source of their happy success, and be encouraged to go on to Confirmation and Holy Communion, to mount still higher in Christian progress; and we, the rest, who have fallen back, perhaps over and over again down the slippery ladder of life, may well pause to think how it may be that our progress has been so fitful and so limited, and whether it might not have been otherwise had we attended more regularly and more specifically to this same work of personal holiness we are now treating of within us. Other motives may have been influencing us. Proud of the excellence of Christianity, and seeing the beauty of it in theory, we may have championed its cause and supported it in every way by our attendance at public worship and helped it outwardly forward in every other way; but none of these motives will help it really onward as a permanent influence in the world, except it be accompanied, or rather grounded on a personal application of the power of God's Holy Spirit within.

So let our prayer be that this power may be deepened in the heart and life of every one of us, and the result must be fruit unto holiness, and the end life everlasting.

SUGGESTIVE OUTLINES FOR PULPIT AND DESK, FOR TEACHERS AND LAY-WORKERS. No. 14.—"The Creator remembered" (Eccles. xii. 1-7, 13, 14). There is no better time to enter the service of the Lord than the present, and surely youth is the proper time of our lives to consecrate to Him who gave us our life. It is a poor sorrowful demonstration of our love and gratitude to God to dwindle out our earthly existence in sin and indifference, and when we come to the threshold of the grave to make a pitiful attempt to call upon God to help us to cross the dark river. Yes, indeed, this is bad to give Satan the service we should have rendered to God. How many times we have been called to renounce Satan, the flesh, and the world! How many times we have been warned! How many young people who have attended our Sunday schools, who have been pleaded with earnestly by their teachers, have gone out from us, and have given no heed to the call of wisdom, who have not given their heart to Christ, who have gone on leaving their boyhood and youth behind until manhood has stared them, as it were, in the face, heeding not the voice of conscience, the call and strivings of the Spirit, the call of God's word, the call of the clergyman and Sunday-school teacher! Thus their youthful days are gone:—

> "There is a path that leads to God,
> All others go astray;
> Narrow but pleasant is the road,
> And Christians love the way."

Let me urge the importance not to be baffled by the insinuations of the evil one, but with faith and prayer, looking to God for help, that you may enter the fold of Jesus Christ. Now, do not delay. Do not make excuse; our sinfulness by nature will soon be ready to make excuses. The evil one and the evil influences around us will soon help us to forget the solemn considerations of religion, and how our soul may be saved from eternal shame. Seek the Lord, that you may avoid the fearful remorse that must come upon those that forget God, who spend their best time in the service of sin. May your choice be made now Whom to serve, may He guide you, then you will enjoy untold blessings in this life, and at last a home of joy unsullied with no more sin and woe. We may learn a few lessons from this subject:—1. Remember God in youth. 2. Remember it is the best time. 3. Remember it will be the joy of your life. 4. Remember it is the best service. 5. Remember it will prepare you for both worlds. 6. It will shield you from the snares of the world. 7. It will bring you an imperishable reward. — THOMAS HEATH, Plymouth.

NOTICES.

All communications respecting the Literary portion of the paper should be addressed to the Editor.
Business communications of every kind should be addressed to Dr. S. GIBBON, at the CHURCH OF ENGLAND PULPIT Office, 160, Fleet Street, London, E.C., to whom cheques and Post-office orders for subscriptions (in advance), three months, 2s., six months, 3s. 6d., twelve months, 6s. 6d., are to be made payable.
The Cases for binding Vol. XXXIV. are now ready.

FOR HEALTH AND IMMORTALITY.

The Ecclesiastical Review.

SATURDAY, JUNE 24, 1893.

ECCLESIASTICAL FEES.

THE charge of the Bishop of Lichfield has again drawn attention to the question of fees payable by the clergy to diocesan officials. The Bishop has had some correspondence with the Rev. J. P. Foster, the clerical Don Quixote, who is tilting, on behalf of his brethren, at this particular windmill. Mr. Foster, in a publication entitled "Complete Guide to all Ecclesiastical Fees," had stated that in the diocese of Lichfield £1. 11s. 6d. was charged for induction instead of £1. 7s. 6d. The Bishop writes to him pointing out that at the present time (1893) only the legal fee is charged. In the course of his reply Mr. Foster says :—

In any fresh edition, if one be needed, I will take care to mention that now only the legal fees for induction are charged in your diocese; my statement was based upon a return made to the House of Lords, printed in 1891, and upon cases brought before me by individual clergymen in your diocese within the last year. May I venture further to say, until very lately, at any rate, curates have been charged 13s. for their licence in your diocese; also, in the return of 1891, it is stated, "The offices of apparitor, seal-keeper, record-keeper, are at present vacant, and the duties are discharged partly by the secretary, without remuneration, and partly by the registrar of the diocese," whereas, *as a matter of fact*, the fees that can be charged by the holders of those offices *have* been charged. Also, presentees to perpetual curacies have often been instituted and inducted as vicars, and the higher fees charged. As your lordship is evidently prepared to give the question your impartial consideration, I venture to quote from the letter of a clergyman in your diocese (but I cannot give his name) to show you how the *clergy* view things :—"I was aware at the time of my institution that I could have been licensed just as I was to my former living, but here the vicar had usually been instituted, and the people evidently expected it, so I said I would be instituted—for otherwise the Bishop does not come to the parish."

The Bishop, in a further letter, says :—

Mr. Redmayne, who was first appointed secretary in March, 1889, *at a fixed salary of £200 a year* (see the return of 1891), was appointed secretary by me on the usual terms on the 1st January, 1892. I need only deal with the question as it affects this diocese since that date.

It is scarcely correct to state that "Until very lately curates have been charged 13s. for their licences." The notice (of which I enclose a copy) points out distinctly that the extra 3s. is payable to the registrar by the incumbent for the copy of the licence supplied to the parish. The secretary always explained that it was optional with the curate to advance this fee or not; and, as a matter of fact, some did and some did not pay it. This method of collecting the registrar's fee for the copy of the licence was first adopted in March, 1892, and so soon as its adoption was brought to my knowledge—viz., in the following August—at my request the practice was discontinued.

The statement in the memorandum in the return of 1891 with regard to the fees for the apparitor, seal-keeper, and record-keeper, refers to the time when the secretary was receiving a fixed salary.

The statement in your letter that presentees to perpetual curacies have often been instituted and inducted as vicars, and the higher fees charged, is correct. It was the rule in this diocese to give the presentee the option. Since August last this option has been withdrawn, and words have been inserted in the form of licence committing the charge of souls to the perpetual curate.

I am grateful to you for giving me the quotation from the letter of a clergyman in this diocese in illustration of the "way in which the *clergy* view things." It gives me the opportunity of assuring you that his statement that "otherwise"—*i.e.*, if a perpetual curate is licensed and not instituted—"the Bishop does not come to the parish," is absolutely untrue, and the whole fabric of his imputation as to the presence of a Bishop depending upon so much money falls to the ground.

The Bishop's reply, apparently intended as a contradiction of Mr. Foster's statements, really admits everything he says. First of all the existence of illegal charges is admitted up to 1892 (the time of the Manchester case).

Secondly. Up till ten months ago an illegal demand was made upon curates. "The secretary always explained that it was optional with the curate to advance this fee or not." What is the point of "explaining" to anybody that it is "optional" to pay somebody else's debts or not. Obviously to suggest to him that he should pay, and, in the Bishop's own words, "Some did and some did not pay." And this went on up till last August.

The next point is about the induction of perpetual curates. Here we get another perfectly unnecessary and perfectly illegal "option."

In his last paragraph the Bishop beats the air. The imputation he implies does not exist in the words he refers to. They are a mere statement of fact. Except for the purpose of induction, there is no ceremonial necessity for the visit of a bishop to a parish on the arrival of its new pastor. A perpetual curate who is merely licensed puts his licence in his pocket and reads himself in. But the occasional presence of a bishop is a great advantage to a parish, and therefore perpetual curates have often chosen the unnecessary and expensive ceremony of induction for the sake of an episcopal visit.

Thus it is true, in a sense, to say that the presence of the Bishop depends on a money payment. But, under the circumstances, no imputation is made thereby upon bishops, unless it be referred to the original cause of the affair, the too, too seldom pastoral tours of bishops.

On the whole, then, the correspondence completely justifies Mr. Foster. It took place as far back as March, 1893, and establishes the truth of his statements up till 1892, and in some cases up till August, 1892. And as the publication in question was derived from Parliamentary papers of 1891, it must be considered pretty well up to date. In fact, Mr. Foster was probably in a great measure responsible for the reforms made in 1892.

The bishops, however, seem determined to stick by their officials, and we are not yet within measurable distance of the only possible state of things, when the bishops will have to pay their own factotums instead of suffering them to pick the pockets of the clergy.

THE PRIEST IN THE PARISH.

MANY thoughtful persons must often have pondered the problem brought up by the Vicar of Greenwich at the Rochester Diocesan Conference, the semi-autocratic position of the parish priest. Since the abolition of Church rates and of the old vestry, the priest has had little or no benefit from the counsels of the laity; such limited activities as are possible through churchwardens are of comparatively little account. Mr. Brooke Lambert's proposition was that lay interest should be revived by means of councils, constituted for the most part of churchwardens and sidesmen.

There can be no doubt that some such system would be a great benefit to the Church. There is no use in blinking the fact that in these democratic days people are less and less inclined to take the *ipse dixit* of a priest in their own affairs. In Church matters that is just what they have to do, and that has a good deal to do with the indifference often shown to the Church. The Church is too much regarded as a private affair of the parson's. If he is a man of tact and common-sense he contrives to carry the people along with him; if not, he generally drives numbers away from him. And the fact will not be disputed that it is the parson's personality more than anything else which regulates attendance at Church, at least in country places. People have left off going to their church, as their own church, they now go to their parson, and stay away if they don't consider him theirs. This is one of the evils of certain modern tendencies. The parish has been lost sight of in the church; the priest, absorbed in his devotion to the one, fails to pay due heed to the other. The people's interest being, on the other hand, centred in the parish, and not in the mere abstract conception of the church, priest and people aim at different things; hence, too often, indifference on their part, failure on his.

Acute quarrels have forced this on public attention from time to time; there have been lately remarkable examples of the entire ritual of parish churches being changed at the will of the parson, but against the will, as far as could be gathered, of the people. And the only remedy left for the people is not to go to church. Some of us would consider it worse than the disease. It is probable that this very principle of popular control, which so many of the clergy kick at, accounts for the vitality of Dissent. It is true that Dissenters overdo it in a number of vexatious ways. But we can use our liberty without abusing it, and too little popular control is as bad as too much. At least the average layman feels that he has a real interest and responsibility in his chapel, which he is, unfortunately, deprived of in his church.

The clergy maintain that they obey their bishops, and that is enough. It has nothing to do with the question. They are not asked to accept any authority as superior or even equal to the bishop's (not that he has much). They are simply invited to consult the wishes and opinions of their people in matters with which the bishop has little or no concern. What does it matter to the Bishop of Barchester if the altar in the parish church of Little Pedlington is surmounted with a cross or not? It may mean a great deal to the people of Little Pedlington. Now we have it on authority that these adornments have no doctrinal significance, they are reduced to matters of mere perpersonal predilection. And why should not the predilections of the people be considered as well as the priest's?

The same principle underlies all the relations of priest and parishioners; the priest ought to act with, as well as for, his parish. Sometimes this may involve a little self-sacrifice, but as a rule only in trifling points. It is not claimed that the priest should yield anything in matters of doctrine, but only that in matters of discipline, organisation, etc., he should adopt means to find out the wishes of his parishioners, and give effect to them as well as his own. And we think that he would gain far more than he would lose by doing so, if in nothing else, at least in the increased enthusiasm he would rouse.

In thus proposing to excite and profit by the interest of the laity in church matters, Mr. Brooke Lambert has shown his usual acute, practical common sense. His motion, it is true, shared the fate of most abstract resolutions; but, nevertheless, he has sounded one of the notes of future success.

The *Yorkshire Post* says that the Rev. R. W. Elliot, vicar of St. Leonard's, New Malton, has unfortunately been compelled, through ill-health, to resign his living.

THE TONGUE AFLAME.

Exposition of Acts ii. 2, 3.

By the Rev. M. B. HOGG, B.A., Incumbent of Keady, Ireland.

You are all aware that the word in the original, which is rendered "tongue" in our Authorised Version, is that from which the English term glossary is derived, and that in the New Testament it is employed in various senses, as well to denote the organ of speech, as to indicate language or dialect. It has also been pointed out by scholars that in Apostolic times when Hellenistic culture was by no means uncommon (St. Paul himself "pleading guilty to the soft impeachment"), the word γλῶσσα or γλῶττα was synonymous with highly-coloured poetic speech. There are some who in their annotations of this amazing narrative assert that the "tongues," which appeared cloven with fire, and resting upon each of them, indicated a spiritual possession which caused those affected to utter indistinct babbling sounds sufficiently incoherent to justify the cynical interjection, "These men are filled with new wine." Others, such as Herder, insist that the word "tongues" must be understood in a subjective sense as referring to an actual infusion of Divine influence which wrought on the believers dynamically, and caused them to utter mysterious words of whose meaning they were themselves but imperfectly cognizant; and there are not wanting many high exegetical authorities who express the conviction that the γλοσσαι (γλῶσσαι) referred unmistakably to a spiritual gift of direct, coherent, and intentional speech, conferred by the Spirit for specific purposes and for missionary objects.

That the word as used in the narrative in the Acts of the Apostles can be interpreted in the first sense seems improbable. It is not likely either that the Evangelist St. Luke who describes this scene should categorise the gift as mere Hellenistic culture, analogous to the sophisms of Plato or other eminent writers, nor is it conceivable that that which St. Peter, who appears to assume the *rôle* of an interpreter on the occasion, describes as fulfilment of prophecy, should be traceable to the maunderings of men whose senses were stunned by the Divine afflatus, and who were unable to express distinctly the mingled feelings that stirred within them.

I cannot pretend to give you any new or startling exposition of this story, but I may perhaps be able to set before you to-day old facts in a new light, and for that purpose my present task has been undertaken.

We may observe as a starting-point that the promise of tongues was one connected essentially with the New Testament era, or rather with the new dispensation. It was laid down by our Saviour as a feature of His Divine administration that "they shall speak with new tongues, they shall take up serpents, and if they drink any deadly thing it shall not hurt them"; and, dating from the Pentecostal era, it will be remembered that the gift of tongues was a distinct possession of certain orders in the Church. Look at such passages as you meet with in Acts xix., when after the laying on of hands (was this confirmation or a setting apart to this specific office indicated by the phrase, "speaking with tongues?" I am rather inclined, having regard to the uniqueness and isolation of the episode, to connect it with the latter), "The Holy Ghost came upon them, and they spake with tongues and prophesied" (Acts xix. 6.) And I believe it will also be admitted by candid readers of the New Testament that the gift was merely temporary—not a lasting possession—you will readily think of that passage in 1 Cor. xiii., where St. Paul apostrophising charity, contrasts with its perpetual character and conditions the fleeting nature of all other gifts. "Whether there be prophecies they shall fail, whether there be tongues they shall cease" (1 Cor. xiii. 8), and indeed this is in itself somewhat of a commentary on his assertion in the previous chapter, that by the same spirit are given to one "working of miracles, to another prophecy, to another discerning of spirits, to another divers kinds of tongues, to another the interpretation of tongues" (1 Cor. xii. 10).

Now we desire to-day to attain some approximate notion of the exact value to be attached to the expression "the gift of tongues," and the strange story we have just dwelt on will furnish us with ample material for our investigation.

Of what nature was this gift evidently conferred for the first time at Pentecost, and continued for a long period in the Christian Church. What were its peculiar characteristics, and how did it affect its recipients?

The writer of the story asserts that "they began to speak with other tongues as the spirit gave them utterance," that is, the infant church in Jerusalem who were "waiting for the promise of the Father," and that these tongues were multiform and world-wide is obvious from the awe struck inquiry of the "devout Jews from every nation under heaven." "How hear we every man speak in our own tongue wherein we were born?" Was this phenomenal gift, what at first sight we are disposed to consider it, the ability to converse and preach in such languages as they must needs become masters of if they desired to carry to the far-off nations the "tidings of great joy"? Or was it a mysterious visitation, the effects of which were startling and apparent, causing the Jews who witnessed the effusion of the Spirit to attribute unexampled endowments to those by whom they were surrounded, but which ceased when the excitement arising from the unforeseen event had passed away?

In recent times, and doubtless within the memory of many of you, very startling phenomena were witnessed at the period of the great Revival of 1859. It was asserted by many witnesses of apparent *bona fides* that some unable to read or write or spell exhibited for a time (there is no evidence that the gift continued) the ability to read whole passages of the sacred Scriptures, and to repeat, as if *memoriter*, considerable portions of the Bible which they could not by any possibility have learned from the Book itself. I have been myself informed by persons who were doubtless sincere in their opinion, and who were themselves firmly persuaded of the *bona fides* of the scenes they witnessed, that several individuals in the counties of Antrim and Derry gave utterance at that exciting period to sacred songs, which, when taken down in writing, were found to answer all metrical conditions and rhythmical restrictions, and this, notwithstanding the ascertained fact that the impassioned singers were absolutely illiterate, and totally indifferent previously to religious concerns. I can refer you, if you desire an interesting and reverent criticism of this mysterious and important spiritual movement, which seemed to sweep over Ulster like a flood, to a sermon preached somewhere about the period of the revival by the

present Provost of Trinity College, Dr. Salmon, then the Professor of Divinity in Dublin University. Can it be possible that the stirring Pentecostal movement which inaugurated the great missionary campaigns of all the Apostles was merely analogous to this wave of religious emotion which flooded only a part of Great Britain and Ireland, wafted across the Atlantic from the sunny and ecstatic West. Doubtless authorities of the eminence of Neander, Gregory of Nyssa, Schneckenburger and Erasmus have classified the Pentecostal scene as merely emotional, having in fact more direct impression on the hearers than the speakers, and some modern critics go so far as to assert that the whole proceedings are but on a par with many aspects of spiritualism, of mesmerism, and of hypnotism, latent truths, which were then but dimly known, but which no doubt existed from the beginning.

And, as might naturally be expected, critics of a less reverent sentiment, who handle sacred topics with by no means sensitive or delicate grasp, can only find in the episode a sudden storm, a lightning flash, a bewildered crowd speaking under the influence of superstition and excitement—in short, a striking analogue of the Virgilian simile—

"Sequitur clamorque virum stridorque rudentum."

But, allowing for all the extravagances permissible in the zealous propagation of a new and fascinating cult, it is impossible to relegate such a scene as that witnessed at Jerusalem to the obscurity deservedly attaching to systems of evanescent and valueless character. If Christianity were merely one of the many nerveless creeds propounded by impetuous and half-dazed propagandists, it might be sufficient to rank this Pentecostal miracle with other unsupported and apocryphal legends ; but the unmistakable fact of the gift of tongues confronts us. That, at all events, refuses to be banished to a contemptible and just obscurity. Apparently the arbitrary criticisms of Ewald, Bunsen, Herder, must be dismissed as outside the range of this inquiry. What remains to be considered? The gift of tongues is conceivable—is admitted even, with reservation, by rationalistic theologians. But of what specific nature was the endowment?

I have already stated my conviction that the gift was specific and for definite objects, and that it continued for some period as a possession by a privileged few in the Christian Church ; but many writers of unquestionable piety and lofty scholarship are unwilling to admit that the gift of tongues can be altogether apprehended in this sense. It is pointed out by Wetstein that the word "utterance" (*ἀποφθέγγεσθαι*) implies something more than speech. It indicates praise and thanksgiving ; and accordingly it is laid down with the precision and certainty of dogma by Andrews, Stanley, and others that the "gift of tongues" must be only understood as a solemn ascription of praise to Jehovah for His wonderful works (*μεγαλεία*), then displayed so visibly, and that when the actual missionary enterprise of the Apostles and brethren began the "tongues" ceased.

Most modern authorities refuse to believe that the infusion of spiritual influence thus vouchsafed (the *ἐπλήσθησαν πνεύματος ἁγιοῦ*) was the ability to preach in the language of that country to which the recipient of the gift was sent. St. Peter himself, after the outpouring, spoke in either Aramaic or Greek, with both of which languages he was doubtless conversant. St. Paul, in Athens, spoke in classic Greek, because he understood it, and quoted, it will be remembered, from Aratus on the occasion ; but in Lystra and Derbe, cities of Lycaonia, it is not at all clear that he used the language familiar to the inhabitants of that region. It would almost seem (Acts xiv. 11) as if he was not acquainted with it ; and in his commentary on the Epistle to the Corinthians, Stanley has remarked with some *empressement* that, if the gift were intended to be used for this purpose, St. Paul would assuredly have commissioned those possessed of this privilege in Corinth to go forth into distant lands and preach the Gospel. They are rather exhorted to repress the tendency to speak with tongues and prophesy. And as a matter of fact but two languages, apart from Hebrew, were then spoken in the civilised world, thanks to the military propagandism of Rome and Persia. Dean Plumptre has the apposite remark in a note on this passage that men were at that time "diglottic to an extent which has no parallel in history."

I am personally inclined to favour the inference drawn by some writers of eminence that the gift of tongues is synonymous with spiritual birth. It will be remembered that in the initial stages of Christianity all converts to the faith were adults, who must really have gone through a stage aptly termed by St. John as "passing from death unto life." And in this connection it is interesting to note the remarkable passage in 1 Corinthians xii., where the various functions of the Spirit are enumerated—wisdom, prophecy, the gift of tongues, discerning of spirits, interpretation of tongues ; but, asserts St. Paul, "All these worketh that self-same spirit, dividing to every man severally as He will."

And it is clear that these gifts were not an isolated or individual possession, but were shared in some degree by all on whom had rested the Holy Spirit by promise. It is within the range of conceivable fact that a new system of belief, inaugurated by the Son of God, and sealed with the outpouring of the Spirit, should confer remarkable blessings and endowments hitherto unexperienced by humanity, which would, from the nature of the case, cause men to marvel and speak exultingly of the *μεγαλεία* of God, but which would cease to strike the world with astonishment when claimed as the possession and heritage of all baptised into Christ. Such gifts we know as absolutely according to the "proposition of faith," and there are no limits to the possibilities of faith. If men can thereby "remove mountains," it is not impossible that in a high degree to-day spiritual attainments and excellencies should be within reach of the Christian. If all things are possible to him that believeth, a Pentecost of blessing might be the portion of any man of keen spiritual aspirations in the world around us. As a chaste writer lately put the case in a leading serial—

> "No one lives apart
> From the mind-dead'ning mart,
> But round his being dense
> Streams benign influence,
> And glimpsed gleams of spirit forms
> Irradiate his heart."

Like St. Chrysostom, such an one speaks not to man, but to himself and God ; and that here and there in the Church's history such refreshing oases appear in the desert of her pilgrimage is a significant fact which adequately demonstrates that spiritual gifts—aye, even gifts of tongues—are not alone confined to the experience of the hundred and twenty at Pentecost.

Not to speak of the rapt prophetic utterances of the seers in Old Testament story, the soothsayers who trafficked in familiar spirits, and who occasionally

were permitted to speak with Divine authority, we can discover almost parallel instances of this gift of tongues vouchsafed to man in other stages of the world's experience. The Montanists, of whom Tertullian is the chief apologist, claimed the function of speaking with tongues and prophesying; and it is idle to deny that some remarkable instances of preternatural gifts are clearly evidenced in individuals of that sect. The pretensions of the Mendicants, six hundred years ago, the spiritual rhapsodies of the Quakers, while pointing to gross exaggeration and self-deception on the part of the many, yet argue a high degree of spirituality in individuals of those bodies.

The very eclecticism of the followers of Ignatius Loyola, and the amazing zeal and power evidenced by the propagandists of the order, its magnetic influence on mankind, its sway over countless hearts, all point to a near approach to extraordinary spiritual gifts, which at all events closely simulate the mysterious influences of Pentecost.

And of course there are few who can fail to call to mind the morbid but startling features of Irvingism, in which interesting, if extravagant, system some pretension to the gift of tongues exists to this day. In Mrs. Oliphant's "Life of Irving" reference is made to the "tongues" employed by the singers in the solemn assembly. It is described as loud, jubilant, exulting, exercising on the hearers the most strange and disturbing influence, convincing them that the Pentecostal gift had been wondrously revived in modern times; and by other chroniclers of the movement it is asserted that many persons, speaking with this "tongue," used a strange medley of Hebrew, Greek, Latin, and various cognate languages.

In the history of Methodism, and in the accounts extant of the Calvinism of Whitefield, similar phenomena are to be witnessed. But, perhaps, the most striking parallel in modern times is to be found in the strange event before alluded to, the Revival of 1859. Psychological phenomena of very mysterious import were frequent characteristics of that movement.*

On the whole, then, I think it may be summed up as a reasonable inference from the facts before us that modern criticism has established the identity of the gift of tongues with a special influence of the Spirit,† to which everyone may aspire who will, and which is, in a greater or lesser degree, the possession of the Christian Church to-day.

* A case cited by the Provost of Trinity College, though, of course, not vouched for by that eminent theologian, presents some very occult features, which some of your readers may explain. A girl stricken by the "Revival" was speechless and in a trance for several days. After an interval she awoke to consciousness, and, although unable to write previously, traced upon paper these words: "I will recover my speech at four o'clock on Tuesday, and lose it on Wednesday at ten." This prediction was actually verified. These are not the Provost's words, and it is only due to him to say that he sees nothing extraordinary in the facts related, "which will appear novel to no one who has been a witness of an exhibition of mesmeric clairvoyance." The same girl, apparently in a hypnotic condition, sang softly, and with apparent accuracy, an entire hymn, one verse of which was noted as follows:—

The way to heaven is straight and plain—
Will you go?
Repent, believe, be born again—
Will you go?
The Saviour cries, and cries to thee,
"Take up thy cross and follow Me,
And thou shalt My salvation see"—
Will you go?

† "Est Deus in nobis agitante calescimus illo." — Ovid, *Fast.* VI.

CORRESPONDENCE.

To the Editor of the Church of England Pulpit and Ecclesiastical Review.

POLYGAMY.

Sir,—The advocacy of polygamy by a clergyman in a recent number of your journal is a sign of these degenerate days, and calls for some protest. The Church of England knows no such doctrine as that of polygamy, and any of her ordained ministers who teach it are unfaithful to her charge and unworthy of their calling.

Polygamy has had its trial among the Oriental nations, and the degradation of woman among those nations that practise it is a sufficient refutation of its claims. It has been weighed in the balance and it is found wanting. We Westerns have therefore no need to make experiment of a system foredoomed to failure. As to the relation of the Mosaic Law to polygamy, it "aimed at mitigating rather than removing evils which were inseparable from the state of society in that day. Its enactments were directed to the discouragement of polygamy. Deut. xvii. 17, Lev. xviii. 18, Exod. xxi. 10, 11" (see Article on Marriage in Smith's "Dictionary of the Bible").

Thus the Mosaic Law treated polygamy much as it treated slavery, both which stand or fall together. And if polygamy is not formally condemned by the Gospel, it is because it is excluded by the elementary principles of morality embodied in the Gospel. Could St. Paul have thought of countenancing polygamy when he set forth marriage as a type of the relation between Christ and His Church (Eph. v. 25-33)? Nay, does not the very use he makes of this sacred relation render such an idea impossible? His precept of marriage also goes to prove the same thing, for he says: "Let every one of you in particular so love his wife (not his wives) even as himself." Both he and the Master himself take us back to the primary principle of the marriage relation as declared in its original institution: "Therefore shall a man leave his father and his mother and shall cleave unto his wife, and they shall be one flesh" (Gen. ii. 24, Mark x. 7, 8, Eph. v. 31). Your correspondent's reference of the pronoun "they" to the two sexes is an unwarrantable gloss used to nullify the fundamental principle of monogamy. "They" or "they twain," as it is given in the New Testament, obviously refers to "man" and "wife" in the preceding clause. Had more wives than one been given to Adam, we should be compelled to accept polygamy; but seeing that in the divine wisdom one wife was sufficient for him, any son of Adam only shows his sinful weakness and wantonness by seeking more.

There is an old proverb which tells us not to jump from the frying-pan into the fire, but this would be the result of polygamy amongst us. Adultery, fornication, uncleanness, lasciviousness, are still too prevalent in this so-called Christian land; but these sins are not new, as will be seen by a reference to Gal. v. 19. St. Paul did not recommend polygamy for such sins, for he would not seek to overcome evil with evil. His counsel was just the contrary, yet it will always be found amply sufficient for its purpose. "Walk in the Spirit and ye shall not fulfil the lust of the flesh" (Gal. v. 16).

As for marriages as commonly contracted, they are

as unsatisfactory as the lives commonly lived, by men and women of the world. And just as, if people would mend their lives, they must have regard to the moral and spiritual laws which God has imposed upon His creatures, so if men and women would have happy married life, and avoid the pains and sorrows of ill-assorted alliances, they must take heed to the teaching of the Divine word. Otherwise, what wonder is it if they make shipwreck of marriage, and that voyage across life's sea, so bravely sped upon the hymeneal morn, end sooner or later like Byron's Dream, in madness and misery.

JAMES SILVESTER.

Cubbington Rectory,
Leighton Buzzard, June 7th, 1893.

THE ORIGIN OF THE IRISH CHURCH.

SIR,—The authority given by your writer for his account of "the origin of the Irish Church" is satisfactory not even to himself. Indeed, it is impossible that the history of an event in the 19th century could be any authority concerning events many centuries previous, so that I must deal, not with your writer's authority, but with his statements of "historical fact."

The Irish Church, which was disestablished in our own time, was not established in the 16th or in the 17th century. It dates from the time of St. Patrick. It was reformed in the 16th century just as the Church of England was reformed nearly at the same time. It was reformed by action on the part of the Church and of the State in the same manner as the English Church was reformed. Some members, clerical and lay, in both countries of the respective churches, dissented from the Reformation, and formed themselves into schismatic societies. The Dissenting community in Ireland was supplied with an episcopate by the Roman Patriarch, about fifty or sixty years after the Reformation of Elizabeth (1559-1562). The Dissenting community in England was furnished in like way with an episcopate about 290 years after the Reformation. Since these schismatic societies respectively received these new dynasties of bishops, they have taken more airs on themselves than they assumed before.

Your writer says that "in the case of the Irish the Church of the people was the Church of Rome," and that in England, "the Church of the people, also at first the Church of Rome," etc. This is utter misstatement. The churches of Ireland and England before the Reformation were subject to a large though undefined authority, exercised by the Roman Court and Patriarch, but were not and could not be, in any way whatever, *the Church* of Rome. In correctness of statement generally arises from confusion of idea, occasionally from error as to fact.

Your writer says that British settlers in Ireland, chiefly Scotch, took over their own forms of religion. What this refers to, except to the colonisation of Ulster, I cannot imagine; and what that colonisation has to do with the matter of the origin of the Irish Church I cannot imagine either. The Scotch colonists brought over their own Church with them, and have kept it ever since, in a more or less flourishing condition; at the present time as vigorous as ever.

He says that the churches, tithes, glebes, etc, were taken from the Irish and given to Protestants. This is true if it would be true to say that the churches, tithes, glebes, etc., in England were taken from the Church of Rome and given to the Church of England. But he cannot think that such a statement as this is true, for he says just before that the English Church reformed itself Yet, with the inconsistency of language that comes either from error as to fact or confusion of view in regarding fact, he ends his letter by saying, not very indirectly, that the English Church had its origin at the Reformation.

Now I have shown that the difference between the English and Irish Reformations is no difference. There were differences in the currents of opinion and in the political conditions which preceded the effecting of those Reformations respectively, and there were differences in the respective results on the two communities. The most prominent difference has been that the extent of the schism in sympathy with the churches of the South of Europe was greater in Ireland than in England, and the number of schismatics very greatly larger in proportion to those who adhered to the old Catholic Churches of the two countries. Your writer is entitled to make as large a point of this as he desires. He is not entitled to make such trash of "historical fact," as he has done, for any purpose. And if I may presume to advise, let me say that it is an unsafe way to defend the continuance of the establishment of the Church in Wales by attacking the Church of Ireland.

EDMUND LAWRENCE.

19th June, 1893.

SIR,—In the interests of fair play perhaps you will allow me to say a few words on this matter. The writer of the article in the PULPIT of June 3rd, alluding to the Church of Ireland, has fallen into a very common error in supposing that the Irish Church was of foreign origin, that it was established in the 16th or 17th century, and that the property of the pre-Reformation Church was seized by the English Parliament in the 17th century, and given to a brand new Church, This is historically untrue (see Wordsworth's "History of the Irish Church," Oxford, 1869), "King's Primer," and the authorities therein quoted.

It is a well-known fact that all the bishops in Ireland at the Reformation under Elizabeth, with two exceptions conformed, kept their sees, and consecrated when required. The parish priests also generally conformed and the laity regularly attended, and continued to resort to their parish churches for many years of Queen Elizabeth's reign. No new church was set up, save indeed the Italian mission.

If the cathedrals, glebes, etc., of the pre-Reformation Church were then taken and bestowed on a new communion established by Parliament, it must have been done in one of two ways—either by (1) Act of Parliament, or by (2) mob violence. If by Act of Parliament, let the Act be quoted; if by mob violence, let the year be mentioned when such a deed was accomplished.

JAMES HALL.

Cork, 20th June, 1893.

THE Rev. H. J. Dukinfield Astley has resigned his post as association secretary of the Missions to Seamen Society for the north-western counties, and is acting for the present as curate-in-charge of the parish of Eccles, Manchester, of which the Hon. and Rev. A. T. Lyttelton was recently appointed vicar.

PREFERMENTS AND APPOINTMENTS.

Aglen, Ven. Anthony Stocker, Archdeacon of St. Andrew's; Chaplain to the Bishop of St. Andrew's.
Breay, Rev. Wilfred H., Curate of Sedbergh; Perpetual Curate of Killington, Kirkby Lonsdale.
Coles, Rev. Vincent Stuckey Stratton, M.A., Vice-Principal of Pusey House, Oxford; Chaplain to the Bishop of St. Andrews.
D'Ombrain, Rev. H., M.A., late Vicar of Stroud, Gloucestershire; General Preacher in the Diocese of Gloucester and Bristol.
Gee, Rev. Henry, B.D., F.S.A., Senior Tutor of St. John's Hall, Highbury; Limborough Lecturer at Spitalfields, and Chaplain to the Worshipful Company of Weavers.
Gough, Rev. Alfred William, M.A., Vicar of Holy Trinity, Wakefield; Vicar of St. John's, Highbury.
Hunter, Rev. Joseph William, Rector of St. Mary's, Dunkeld; Chaplain to the Bishop of St. Andrews.
Kelty, Rev. J., Assistant-Curate of Christ Church, Denton; Diocesan Secretary of the C.E.T.S., Manchester.
Lucas, Rev. William, M.A.; Vicar of Burstwick, Hull.
Molloy, Rev. Eben, B.A.; Rector of Keystone, Hunts.
Parish, Rev. William Okes, M.A., Vicar of Longfleet; Rural Dean of Poole.
Payne-Smith, Rev. Robert, M.A., Rector of Milton-next-Sittingbourne, Kent; Vicar of St. Lawrence's in Thanet with Manston, Ramsgate.
Peirson, Rev. F. W., Curate; Vicar of Sarisbury, Hants.
Philpott, Rev. J. N., M.A., Rector of Stoke Albany, Market Harborough; Rector of Southchurch, Essex.
Rigg, Rev. W. Pace, M.A.; Rector of Orton Waterville, Peterborough.
Roberts, Rev. Charles Manley, B.D., Rector of Brinkley, Newmarket; Rector of Aldridge, Walsall.
Roberts, Rev. Canon Hugh, Vicar of Brymbo; Perpetual Curate of the new District Chapelry of St. Paul's, Colwyn Bay (formerly part of the Parish of Llandrillo-yn-Rhos).
Skeels, Rev. Serocold Clarke, M.A.; Vicar of Evington, Leicester.
Smythe, Rev. Canon, Rector of Carmoney, and Treasurer of the Cathedral Church of St. Saviour's, Connor; Archdeacon of Connor.
Walsh, Rev. James Horridge, D.D., Incumbent of St. Stephen's, Dublin; Canon of Christ Church Cathedral, Dublin.
Watson, Rev. F., D.D., Lecturer in Theology, St. John's College, Cambridge, Vicar of Quy; Vicar of St. Edward's, Cambridge.
Whitehead, Rev. S. F., B.A.; Rector of Aston Somerville, Gloucestershire.

CLERICAL OBITUARY.

Daniel, Rev. William Dack, M.A., Priest, at Wymondham, on the 9th inst., aged 84.

Ellerton, Rev. John, M.A., Hon. Canon of St. Albans, late Rector of White Roding, Essex, at Rosemont, Torquay, on the 15th inst., aged 66.

Harding, Rev. John Wingfield, formerly Vicar of Cheswardine, Market Drayton, at Churchfield, Market Drayton, on the 6th inst., aged 75.

Hillyard, Rev. Temple, twenty-two years Rector of Okeford and forty-five years Canon Residentiary of Chester, at Okeford, Devon, on the 16th inst., aged 85.

Hughes, Rev. George Bilsborrow, of Jesus College, Cambridge, M.A., and the Middle Temple, Barrister-at-Law, and retired Judge of County Court, at 52, Marina, St. Leonards-on Sea, on the 14th inst.

Mozley, Rev. Thomas, M.A., of Oriel College, Oxford, late Rector of Plymtree, Devon, at 7, Lansdown-terrace, Cheltenham, on the 17th inst.

Somerset, Rev. Boscawen T. G. H., Rural Dean, at the Rectory, Crickhowell, on the 13th inst., aged 60.

Weidemann, Rev. C. F., M.A., British Chaplain in Hamburg during the past forty-one years, at Altona, on the 13th inst., aged 76.

West, Rev. Henry, at Wraysbury House, Wraysbury, on the 13th inst., aged 58.

FIRST REMOVE THE CAUSE.

MEN frequently worry and trouble themselves a great deal in trying to cure the symptoms of vital weakness, nervous exhaustion, and kindred ailments, instead of endeavouring to first remove the cause. This can be done by Mr. Harness' Electropathic Treatment without the aid of drugs. It is useless to tell sufferers to employ their minds and bodies in useful work and to forget their disorders, so long as the cause of their troubles is not removed. How can it be expected that when they are fatigued by the least exertion they can occupy themselves by studying, walking, or other exercise? Even in conversation they frequently lose the thread of it and repeatedly find their memory failing them. What can they do? Physic will not cure them—perhaps the leading physicians have failed to afford them any relief, and they have consequently become hopeless. It is to such as these that Mr. Harness' new combined Electropathic Belt and Suspensory is so strongly recommended, as, by its gentle but continuous action, invigorating electric currents are imperceptibly generated and conveyed direct from the spinal cord to the affected parts. It is this scientifically constructed and convenient appliance which silently but surely acts upon the vital organs, and removes the cause of the patient's disease, effecting a wonderful change in his health, character, and conduct, and speedily enabling him to return to his natural tastes and habits, and enjoy once more the full vigour of youth, with all its accompanying pleasures.

We may add that this perfect Electro-medical appliance is exceedingly comfortable to wear, gives wonderful support and vitality to all the internal organs of the body, prevents chills, imparts new life and vigour to the debilitated constitution, stimulates the organic action, promotes the circulation, assists digestion, and promptly renews that vital energy, the loss of which is the first symptom of decay. Its healing properties are multifarious. It stimulates the functions of various organs, increases their secretions, gives tone to muscle and nerves, relaxes morbid contractions, improves nutrition, and effectually renews exhausted nerve force. Acting directly on the system, it sustains and assists its various functions, and thus promotes the health and vigour of the entire frame. Besides these benefits, the mind is maintained in a buoyant, cheerful state, and every faculty is stimulated to the highest condition of intellectual strength.

Gentlemen who read the above announcement have only to visit London and call at the Electropathic and Zander Institute (52, Oxford Street, W.) to be convinced of the marvellous curative powers of Electricity and Mr. Harness' perfect methods of imperceptibly applying the current. The medical officers of the establishment are in daily attendance, and may be consulted free of charge either personally or by letter.

UNIVERSITY OF ILLINOIS-URBANA
3 0112 028229158